Introduction to Software Engineering Project Authorship Detection

Code and Report due: Midnight Friday May 31st (end Week 15)

Introduction

Automated authorship detection is the process of using a computer program to analyze a large collection of texts one of which has an unknown author, and making guesses about the author of that unattributed text. The basic idea is to use different statistics from the text – called "features" in the machine learning community – to form a linguistic "signature" for each text. One example of a simple feature is the number of words per sentence. Some authors may prefer short sentences while others tend to write sentences that go on and on with lots and lots of words and not very concisely, just like this one. Once we have calculated the signatures of two different texts we can determine their similarity and calculate a likelihood that they were written by the same person.

In this assignment, students will write a number of small functions that each calculate an individual linguistic feature. They will apply their functions to a piece of mystery text and combine the features into a signature which they will compare to a set of known signatures for famous authors and make a prediction about the author of the mystery file.

Summary

- 1. Define small functions that each operate on a piece of text and calculate a linguistic feature represented by a floating point value.
- 2. Combine these values to produce an author signature.
- 3. Define a similarity measure for pairs of authors.
- 4. Compare the calculated signature for a mystery text with signatures for known authors read from input files and predict the author of the unattributed text.

You should spend *at least* one hour reading through this handout to make sure you understand what is required, so that you don't waste your time going in circles, or worse yet, hand in something you think is correct and find out later that you misunderstood the specifications. Highlight the handout and find all the things you're not sure about as soon as possible.

Authorship Detection

Automated authorship detection has uses in plagiarism detection, email-filtering, social-science research and as forensic evidence in court cases. Also called authorship attribution, this is a current research field and the state-of-the-art linguistic features are considerably more complicated than the five simple features that we will use for our program. But even with our very basic features and simplifications, your program may still be able to make some reasonable predictions about authorship.

We have begun a program that guesses the author of a text file based on comparing it to a set of linguistic signatures. Download find_author.py from Moodle. This program runs, but does almost nothing, because many of the functions' bodies do little or nothing. One symptom of this is that the program crashes if the user types in any invalid inputs. In particular, it requests the name of a directory (another name for folder) of linguistic signature files and expects the directory to contain only those files – more about that later. Your task is to complete the program by filling in the missing pieces.

An Overview: How the program works

The program begins by asking the user for two strings: the first is the name of a file of text whose authorship is unknown (the mystery file) and the second is the name of a directory of files, each containing one linguistic signature.

The program calculates the linguistic signature for the mystery file and then calculates scores indicating how well the mystery file matches each signature file in the directory. The author from the signature file that best matches the mystery file is reported.

Some Definitions: What really is a sentence?

Before we go further, it will be helpful to agree on what we will call a sentence, a word and a phrase. Let's define a **token** to be a string that you get from calling the string method <code>split</code> on a line of the file. We define a **word** to be a non-empty token from the file that isn't completely made up of punctuation. You'll find the "words" in a file by using <code>str.split</code> to find the tokens and then removing the puctuation from the words using the <code>clean_up</code> function that we provided in <code>find_author.py</code>. If after calling <code>clean_up</code> the resulting word is an empty string, then it isn't considered a word. Notice that <code>clean_up</code> converts the word to lowercase. This means that once they have been cleaned up, the words yes, Yes and YES! will all be the same.

For the purposes of this assignment, we will consider a **sentence** to be a sequence of characters that (1) is terminated by (but doesn't include) the characters or the end of the file, (2) excludes whitespace on either end, and (3) is not empty. Consider sentence_example.txt on Moodle. Remember that a file is just a linear sequence of characters, even though it looks two dimensional. This file contains these characters:

this is the \nfirst sentence. Isn't\nit? Yes!!! This \n\nlast bit:) is also a sentence, but \nwithout a terminator other than the end of the file\n

By our definition, there are four "sentences" in it:

Sentence 1	"this is the\nfirst sentence"
Sentence 2	"Isn't\nit"
Sentence 3	"Yes"
Sentence 4	"This \n\nlast bit :) is also a sentence, but \nwithout a terminator other than the end of the file"

Notice that:

- The sentences do not include their terminator character.
- The last sentence was not terminated by a character; it finishes with the end of the file.
- Sentences can span multiple lines of the file.

Phrases are defined as non-empty sections of sentences that are separated by colons, commas, or semi-colons. The sentence prior to this one has three phrases by our definition. This sentence right here only has one (because we don't separate phrases based on parentheses).

We realize that these are not the correct definitions for sentences, words or phrases but using them will make the assignment easier. More importantly, it will make your results match what we are expecting when we test your code. You may not "improve" these definitions **or your assignment** will be marked as incorrect.

Linguistic features we will calculate

The first linguistic feature recorded in the signature is the **average word length**. This is simply the average number of characters per word, calculated after the punctuation has been stripped using the already-written <code>clean_up</code> function. In the sentence prior to this one, the average word length is 5.909. Notice that the comma and the final period are stripped but the hyphen inside "already-written" and the underscore in "clean_up" are both counted. That's fine. You must not change the <code>clean_up</code> function that does punctuation stripping.

Type-Token Ratio is the number of different words used in a text divided by the total number of words. It's a measure of how repetitive the vocabulary is. Again you must use the provided clean_up function so that "this", "This", "this," and "(this" are *not* counted as different words.

Hapax Legomana Ratio is similar to Type-Token Ratio in that it is a ratio using the total number of words as the denominator. The numerator for the Hapax Legomana Ratio is the number of words occurring exactly once in the text. Use this approach: As you read the file, keep two lists. The first contains all the words that have appeared at least once in the text and the second has all the words that have appeared at least twice in the text. Of course, the words on the second list must also appear on the first. Once you've read the whole text, you can use the two lists to calculate the number of words that appeared *exactly* once.

The fourth linguistic feature your code will calculate is the **average number of words per sentence**.

The final linguistic feature is a measure of **sentence complexity** and is the average number of phrases per sentence. We will find the phrases by taking each sentence, as defined above, and splitting it on any of colon, semi-colon or comma.

Since several features require the program to split a string on any of a set of different separators, it makes sense to write a helper function to do this task. To do this you will complete the function split_on_separators as described by the docstring in the code.

Finding the Sentences

Because sentences can span multiple lines of the file, it won't work to process the file one line at a time calling split_on_separators on each individual line. Instead, create a single huge string that stores the entire file. Then call split_on_separators on that string. This solution would waste a lot of space for really large files but it will be fine for our purposes.

There are other ways where our assignment design isn't very efficient. For example, having the different linguistic features calculated by separate functions means that our program has to keep going over the text file doing many of the same actions (breaking it into words and cleaning them up) for each feature. This is inefficient if we are certain that anyone using our code would always be calculating all the features. However, our design allows another program to import our module and efficiently calculate a single linguistic feature without calculating the others. It also makes the code easier to understand, which in today's computing environment is often more important than efficiency.

Signature Files

We have created a set of signature files for you to use that have a fixed format. The first line of each file is the name of the author and the next five lines each contain a single real number. These are values for the five linguistic features in the following order:

- Average Word Length
- Type-Token Ratio
- Hapax Legomana Ratio
- Average Sentence Length
- Sentence Complexity

Determining the best match

In order to determine the best match between an unattributed text and the known signatures, the program uses the function <code>compare_signatures</code> which calculates and returns a measure of the similarity of two linguistic signatures. You could imagine developing some complicated schemes but our program will do almost the simplest thing imaginable. The similarity of signatures <code>a</code> and <code>b</code> will be calculated as the sum of the differences on each feature, but with each difference multiplied by a "weight" so that the influence of each feature on the total score can be controlled. In other words, the similarity of signatures <code>a</code> and <code>b</code> (Sab) is the sum over all five features of: the absolute value of the feature difference times the corresponding weight for that feature. The equation below expresses this definition mathematically:

$$S_{ab} = \sum_{i=1}^{5} ||f_{i,a} - f_{i,b}|| * w_i$$

where $f_{i,x}$ is the value of feature i in signature x and w_i is the weight associated with feature i.

The example below illustrates. Each row concerns one of the five features. Suppose signature 1 and signature 2 are as shown in columns 2 and 3, and the features are weighted as shown in column 4. The final column shows the contribution of each feature to the overall sum, which is 16.5. It represents the similarity of signatures 1 and 2.

Feature number	Value of feature in signature 1	Value of feature in signature 2	Weight of feature	Contribution of this feature to the sum
1	4.4	4.3	11	abs(4.4-4.3)*11 = 1.1
2	0.1	0.1	33	abs(0.1-0.1)*33 = 0
3	0.05	0.04	50	abs(0.05-0.04)*50 = .5
4	10	16	0.4	abs(10-16)*0.4 = 2.4
5	2	4	4	abs(2-4)*4 = 8
SUM				12

Notice that if signatures 1 and 2 were exactly the same on every feature, the similarity would add up to zero. (It may have made sense to call this "difference" rather than similarity.) Notice also that if they are different on a feature that is weighted higher, there overall similarity value goes up more than if they are different on a feature with a low weight. This is how weights can be used to tune the importance of different features.

You are required to complete function <code>compare_signatures</code> according to the docstring and you must not change the header. Notice that the list of weights is provided to the function as a parameter. We have already set the weights that your program will use (see the main block) so you don't need to play around trying different values.

Additional requirements

- Where a docstring says a function can assume something about a parameter (e.g., it might say "text is a non-empty list") the function should not check that this thing is actually true. Instead, when you call the function make sure that it is indeed true.
- Do not change any of the existing code. Add to it as specified in the comments.
- Do not add any user input or output, except where you are explicitly told to. In those cases, we have provided the exact print or raw_input statement to use. Do not modify these.
- Functions get_valid_filename and read_directory_name must not use any for loops. The purpose of this is to make sure you get comfortable with while loops.
- You must not use any break or continue statements. We are imposing this restriction

because they are very easy to "abuse," resulting in terrible code.

How to tackle this assignment

This program is much larger than anythink that you have written before, so you'll need a good strategy for how to tackle it. Here is our suggestion.

Principles:

- To avoid getting overwhelmed, deal with one function at a time. Start with functions that don't call any other functions; this will allow you to test them right away. The steps listed below give you a reasonable order in which to write the functions.
- Keep in mind throughout that any function you have might be a useful helper for another function. Take advantage of opportunities to call an existing function.
- As you write each function, begin by designing it in English, using only a few sentences. If your design is longer than that, shorten it by describing the steps at a higher level that leaves out some of the details. When you translate your design into Python, look for steps that are described at such a high level that they don't translate directly into Python. Design a helper function for each of these, and put a call to the helpers into your code. Don't forget to write a great docstring for each helper!

Steps:

Here is a good order in which to solve the pieces of this assignment.

- 1. Read this handout thoroughly and carefully, making sure you understand everything in it, particularly the different linguistic features.
- 2. Read the starter code to get an overview of what you will be writing. It is not necessary at this point to understand every detail of the functions we have provided in order to make progress on this assignment.
- 3. Write and test function <code>get_valid_filename</code>. In order to determine whether a file exists or not, use the function <code>os.path.exists</code>. Give it a string that is the name of a file, and <code>os.path.exists</code> will return a boolean indicating whether or not the file exists. The help for this function talks about giving it a path (which is a description of the file and where it exists among all your folders), but if you give it a string that is simply a file name, it will check in the folder in which your code is running.
- 4. Write and test function read_directory_name. Use the function os.path.isdir to check if a string is a valid directory.
- 5. Write and test functions for the first three linguistic features: average_word_length, type_token_ratio, and hapax_legomana_ratio.
- 6. Write and test function split_on_separators. Test this function carefully on its own before trying to use it in your other functions.
- 7. Write and test function average_sentence_length. Begin by writing code to extract the sentences from the file. Test that this part of your code works correctly before you worry about calculating the average length.
- 8. Complete avg_sentence_complexity and finally compare_signatures.

- 9. Now you have implemented all the functions. Run our a2_self_test module to confirm that your code passes our most basic tests. Correct any errors that this uncovers. But of course if you did a great job of testing your functions as you wrote them, you won't find any new errors now.
- 10. You are now ready to run the full author detection program: run find_author. To do this you will need to set up a folder that contains **only** valid linguistic signature files. We are providing a set of these on CS Server. You'll also want some mystery text files to analyze. We have put a number of these on CS Server. If you are copying them to your laptop, don't put them in the same folder as the linguistic signature files.

Testing your code

We are providing a module called a2_self_test that imports your find_author and checks that most of the required functions satisfy some of the basic requirements. It does not check the two functions that involve input and output with the user: get_valid_filename and read directory name.

When you run a2_self_test.py, it should produce no errors and its output should consist only of one thing: the word "okay". If there is any other output at all, or if any input is required from the user, then your code is not following the assignment specifications correctly and will be marked as incorrect. Go back and fix the error(s).

While you are playing with your program, you may want to use the signature files and mystery text files we have provided. This in conjunction with a2_self_test is still **not** sufficient testing to thoroughly test all of your functions under all possible conditions. With the functions on this assignment, there are many more possible cases to test (and cases where your code could go wrong). If you want to get a great mark on the correctness of your functions, do a great job of testing them under all possible conditions. Then we won't be able to find any errors that you haven't already fixed!

Submitting your report

For this assignment, submit two files to Moodle:

- find_author.py
- Group_number_groupname.pdf

Once you have submitted, be sure to check that you have submitted the correct version. Remember that spelling of filenames, including case, counts. **Your file must be named exactly as above.**

I will give you details of what you need to write in your report next week.