

#DebateNight: The Role and Influence of **Socialbots** in the Democratic Process

Marian-Andrei Rizoiu

Timothy Graham

Rui Zhang

Yifei Zhang

Robert Ackland

Lexing Xie

ComputationalMedia @ANU: http://cm.cecs.anu.edu.au

Two influencers: the 2016 U.S. Presidential elections



Jenna Abrams

@Jenn_Abrams

Politics is a circus of hypocrisy. I DO care. Any offers/ideas/questions? DM or email me jennnabrams@gmail.com (Yes, there are 3 Ns, this is important)

VUSA

S jennabrams.com

- i Joined October 2014
- Ø Born on October 02

60k followers



Tennessee GOP @TEN_GOP

I love God, I Love my Country

Tennessee, USA Joined November 2015

136k followers

Common traits:

- Pro-republican;
- Highly influential, highly followed and retweeted;
- Opinion leaders;



Two influencers: the 2016 U.S. Presidential elections



Jenna Abrams

@Jenn_Abrams

Politics is a circus of hypocrisy. I DO care. Any offers/ideas/questions? DM or email me jennnabrams@gmail.com (Yes, there are 3 Ns, this is important)

VUSA

S jennabrams.com

- i Joined October 2014
- Born on October 02

60k followers



Tennessee GOP @TEN_GOP

I love God, I Love my Country

Tennessee, USA
Joined November 2015

136k followers

Common traits:

- Pro-republican;
- Highly influential, highly followed and retweeted;
- Opinion leaders;
- . .

Russian-controlled bots operated by the Internet Research Agency in St. Petersburg

[Forbes, The Guardian, CNN + 50 more]

The political influence of socialbots

SocialBots:

"Software processes that are programmed to appear to be human-generated within the context of social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter" (Gehl and Bakardjieva 2016, p.2)

Immediate and long term research questions:

- are socialbots influential in the political discourse?
- did they have political partisanship?
- *(long term)* were they instrumental for the results of the elections?

#DebateNight dataset



- First U.S. Presidential Debate (26 sept 2016, 8.45pm to 10.45pm EDT)
- Twitter Firehose

Dataset stats:

- length: **90 minutes**
- #tweets: **6.5**M
- #users: **1.45**M

Hashtags:

#DebateNight #Debates2016 #election2016 #HillaryClinton #Debates, #Hillary2016 #DonaldTrump #Trump2016

Presentation outline







User influence

Political partisanship

User botness









$$p_{ij} = \frac{m_i e^{-r(t_j - t_i)}}{\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} m_k e^{-r(t_j - t_k)}}$$

branching probability

$$p_{ij} = \frac{m_i \mathbf{e}^{-\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{t}_j - \mathbf{t}_i)}}{\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} m_k e^{-r(t_j - t_k)}}$$

branching probability

- users retweet fresh content [Hawkes 1971] [Wu and Huberman 2007]



branching probability

- users retweet fresh content [Hawkes 1971] [Wu and Huberman 2007]

- preferential attachment [Barabási 2005]



branching probability

- users retweet fresh content [Hawkes 1971] [Wu and Huberman 2007]

- preferential attachment [Barabási 2005]

Tweet influence: the expected number of retweets, averaged over all possible trees.

But ... (n - 1)! trees 10^{156} trees for 100 tweets



Tractable influence computation

Pair-wise influence score m_{ij}



. . .



Tractable influence computation

Pair-wise influence score m_{ij}

 $m_{15} = m_{11}p_{15} + m_{12}p_{25} + m_{13}p_{35} + m_{14}p_{45}$



Recursive algorithm $O(n^3)$

Presentation outline







User influence

Political partisanship

User botness



Polarization and engagement (1)

Protocol:

- Top 1000 most frequent hashtags
- Manually labeled as *clearly partisan* pro-democrat or pro-republican

Partisanship stats:

- pro-Democrat hashtags: 93
- pro-Republican hashtags: 86
- partisan tweets: **65**K
- partisan users: **47**K



Polarization and engagement (2)

For each user *i*:

- *dem_i* #democrat hashtags
- *rep*_i #republican hashtags



 $\mathcal{P}(u_i) = \frac{rep_i - dem_i}{rep_i + dem_i}$

Polarization and engagement (2)

For each user *i*:

- *dem_i* #democrat hashtags
- *rep*_i #republican hashtags





Botness score and bot detection

Bot detection:

- BotOrNot [Davis et al, WWW '16] [Varol et al, ICWSM'17]
 - RandomForest classifier
 - more than 1000 features from metadata
 - o very likely human 1 – very likely bot
 - 94.5% precision



Separating bots from humans

Three populations

Population	Effective
All	1,451,388
Protected	45,316
Suspended	10,162

Separating bots from humans



[Varol et al, ICWSM'17] use a threshold of 0.5

Presentation outline







User influence

Political partisanship

User botness



Activity profiling



Bots and **Suspended** are more active than **Humans** and **Protected** Some **Bots** are highly followed, while most are ignored

User influence





The average **Bot** has 2.5 times more influence than the average **Human** The average pro-Republican **Bot** is twice as influential as the average pro-Democrat **Bot**

Political partisanship



Bots are more likely to be pro-Republican (than pro-Democrat) Very highly influential users are more likely to be pro-Democrat

0.6

User influence arphi %

0.7

8.0

0.9

Political polarization

conditioned on user influence

Republican

Democrat

0.3

0.4

0.5

Political polarization

10

0.8

0.6

0.4

20

0.0

Polarization map



Polarization map







Summary



A scalable algorithm to estimate user influence from latent network structures



Three measures to quantify the influence, the political partisanship and botness of Twitter users



A detailed analysis of the role and influence of socialbots during the first U.S. Presidential debate.

Summary



A scalable algorithm to estimate user influence from latent network structures



Three measures to quantify the influence, the political partisanship and botness of Twitter users



A detailed analysis of the role and influence of socialbots during the first U.S. Presidential debate.

Limitations:

Organizational accounts appear as **Bots**; binary partisanship characterization (e.g. independent voters)

Were Bots instrumental for the results of the elections?

#DebateNight: The Role and Influence of **Socialbots** in the Democratic Process

https://github.com/computationalmedia/cascade-influence





A scalable algorithm to estimate user influence from latent network structures



Three measures to quantify the influence, the political partisanship and botness of Twitter users



A detailed analysis of the role and influence of socialbots during the first U.S. Presidential debate.

Limitations:

Organizational accounts appear as **Bots**; binary partisanship characterization (e.g. independent voters)

Were Bots instrumental for the results of the elections?

Tractable influence computation

Pair-wise influence score: $m_{ij} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} m_{ik} p_{kj} & , i < j \\ 1 & , i = j \\ 0 & , i > j. \end{cases} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} G_1 & 5 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline G_3 & 5 \end{array}} \begin{vmatrix} G_2 & 5 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline G_4 & \hline G_6 & \hline G_6 & \hline G_7 & \hline G_7 & \hline G_8 & \hline G_$

Influence of a tweet: k

$$\varphi(v_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n m_{ij}.$$

Influence of a user:

$$\varphi(u) = \frac{\sum_{v \in \mathcal{T}(u)} \varphi(v)}{|\mathcal{T}(u)|}, \quad \mathcal{T}(u) = \{v | u_v = u\}$$

Supp: Influence vs. cascade size



Density plot for 653K users (45% users start a cascade)

Supp: Influence vs. cascade size



Density plot for 653K users (45% users start a cascade)



Seth MacFarlane @SethMacFarlane

The Official Twitter Page of Seth MacFarlane - "THE ORVILLE" Thursdays at 9/8c on Fox

Los Angeles
facebook.com/pages/Seth-Mac...
S-a alăturat în ianuarie 2009

actor and filmmaker 10.8 million followers



Michael Ian Black <> @michaelianblack

Nine years in the NFL. Two rings.

The wilds of Connecticut

 ${\mathscr S}$ michaelianblack.com

🖽 S-a alăturat în februarie 2009

comedian

2.1 million followers

Supp: Influence vs. number of followers



Supp: Influence vs. number of followers





Initiated a big cascade

@tiwtter1tr4_tv

This account has been permanently suspended

Twitter suspends accounts which violate the Twitter Rules

now suspended 1 follower Initiated a big cascade