

# Identifying and Investigating the Feasibility of Cross-Domain Authorship Analysis



Daway Chou-Ren<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Byron Gao<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Princeton University <sup>2</sup> Texas State University

#### Introduction

#### Traditional Problem

- Given an anonymous document, can we identify which candidate's writings samples it most closely resembles?
- Solution: Extract stylometric features from writing samples, use statistical or machine learning algorithms to classify unknown document<sup>1</sup>
- Applications: the Federalist Papers, Shakespeare plays, poetry, newspaper articles, novels<sup>2</sup>
- Commonality? All print-based, large samples available, well-formed writing, same topic, few candidate authors

#### Contemporary Problem

- Can we identify shorter, noisier electronic documents that have more candidate authors?
- Solution: Increase feature sets, incorporating misspellings, emoticons, document structure, Internet lingo, etc. <sup>3</sup>
- Applications: chat logs, forum posts, emails, tweets<sup>4</sup>
   Commonality? Short samples, noisy, many candidates, but
- Commonality? Short samples, noisy, many candidates, but single-domain

#### Our New Cross-Domain Problem

 Is it possible to use writing samples to identify an unknown message from a different domain? Can a blog post be used to identify an email? Or a Facebook message a tweet?

#### Why?

- Online domains allow for anonymity
- No way to get labeled posts from anonymous forum, email account, Facebook account, etc.
- Can hopefully find labeled text from another domain—emails from court injunction, old schoolwork, etc.

## Model and Methodology

#### Feature Set

Feature	Count	Example
Word/sentence-based frequencies	23	# tokens
Character-based frequencies	63	a-z, 0-9
Vocabulary richness metrics	4	Sichel's S
Capitalization types	4	ALL CAPS
Function word frequencies	260	a, an, and
Internet lingo frequencies	116	lol, haha
Part of speech tags and bigrams	51	NN NNPS
Syntactic parent-child pairs	769	VB VBD
Total	1290	

# An End-to-End System Results and Discussion

Unknown

Unknown

Unknown

Who/WP

wrote/VBD

this/DT

document/NN

WP VBD

**VBD DT** 

DT NN

NN.

Processed

**Documents** 

Document

Vectors

Feature

Preprocess and Form Corpus

**Extract Feature Vectors** 

Postprocess and Normalize

**Neural Network** 

Best experimental results are achieved using a neural network,

correlation based filter works well for feature selection.

though any classifier can be used. An aggregate ensemble fast

A Closer Look at Feature Extraction

sentence, and by line. They are also tokenized for part of speech

tagging and syntactic parsing through the Stanford NLP toolkit.

Who wrote this document?

Documents are split on multiple levels: by character, word,

(ROOT

(SBARQ

(WHNP (WP Who))

(VP (VBD wrote)

[ROOT SBARQ], [SBARQ WHNP],

[WHNP WP], [SQ VP], [VP VBD]

[SBARQ SQ], [SBARQ .],

[VP NP], [NP DT], [NP NN]

(NP (DT this) (NN document))

# Unknown Model Validation # of

Corpus	# of Suspects	Tokens per Suspect	Accuracy
Federalist Papers	4	9,000 – 150,000	97%
Sports Columns	6	2000 x 10 = ~20,000	93%
Research Papers	3	7500 x 15 = ~100,000	100%
Facebook Messages	8	1500	88%
College Assignments	10	25,000 x 6 = 150,000	88%

Federalist Papers	Sports Columns	Research Papers
In the extent and proper structure of the Union, therefore, we behold a republican remedy for the diseases most incident to republican government.	June 2011: Detroit, \$325 million October 2011: Philly, \$280 million June 2012: New Orleans, \$338 million October 2012: Memphis, \$377 million	[3] proposes a probabilistic framework based on Hidden Markov Random Fields, incorporating supervision into k-clustering al-gorithms. [8]

- High accuracies for traditional problems
- High accuracies for contemporary problems
- Handles noise very well

#### Defining Domains

- Same student may turn in a term paper similar to the Federalist Papers and a lab report similar to a research paper
- Predicting College Assignments from each other is actually a cross-domain problem

# Two documents may be considered to exist in separate domains when required document structure, purpose, or

- audience changes structural, syntactic, or lexical patterns, but not content.
- friend vs to a coworker
- Abbasi *et al.*'s Writeprint clustering technique can be seen as attempting to find a single-domain solution from a cross-domain problem<sup>5</sup>

#### Domain-Independent Feature Set

















### Initial Results

Corpus		Tokens per Suspect	Dummy classification
Facebook Posts from Facebook Messages	8	250 – 1500	5/8

- Posts: brief, public reactions
- Messages: possibly length and private conversations
- Additional difficulty dealing with insufficient tokens per suspect<sup>6</sup>

#### Conclusion

This study investigated authorship analysis from a new direction focusing on cross-domain analysis

- . We identified and defined cross-domain analysis as a future direction in authorship studies
- 2. We validated a single-domain model and demonstrated relative failure for cross-domain applications
- 3. We achieved positive initial results on a small sample set, demonstrating feasibility of a potential solution

#### Future Research

- Experiment with balanced feature set
- Expand cross-domain corpus
- Increase length of documents and number of samples
- More pre- and post- processing
- Test other domain combinations
  - Blogs, essays, emails, tweets

## Acknowledgements

This work was made possible by the Texas State University Computer Science Department, Benjamin Fung, and Neil Gong. This research was funded by NSF REU award #1358939.

#### References

- Rudman, Joseph. "The state of authorship attribution studies: Some problems and solutions." Computers and the Humanities 31, no. 4 (1997): 351-365.
- 2. Koppel, M., Schler, J., & Argamon, S. (2009). Computational methods in authorship attribution. *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology, 60*(1), 9-26.
- 3. Stamatatos, E. (2009). A survey of modern authorship attribution methods. Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology, 60(3), 538-556.
- I. Smalheiser, N. R., & Torvik, V. I. (2009). Author name disambiguation. Annual review of information science and technology, 43(1), 1-43.
- 5. Abbasi, A., & Chen, H. (2008). Writeprints: A stylometric approach to identity-level identification and similarity detection in cyberspace. ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS), 26(2), 7.
- 6. Layton, R., Watters, P., & Dazeley, R. (2010, July). Authorship attribution for twitter in 140 characters or less. In Cybercrime and Trustworthy Computing Workshop (CTC), 2010 Second (pp. 1-8). IEEE.

#### Contact Information

Daway Chou-Ren: dchouren@princeton.edu