

The Spread of Propaganda by Coordinated Communities on Social Media

Kristina Hristakieva¹, Stefano Cresci^{2*}, Giovanni Da San Martino³, Mauro Conti³, Preslav Nakov⁴

¹ Sofia University, Bulgaria

² IIT-CNR, Italy

³ University of Padova, Italy

⁴ QCRI-HBKU, Qatar

christina.hristakieva@gmail.com, s.cresci@iit.cnr.it, dasan@math.unipd.it, conti@math.unipd.it, pnakov@hbku.edu.qa

Abstract

Large-scale manipulations on social media have two important characteristics: (i) use of *propaganda* to influence others, and (ii) adoption of *coordinated behavior* to spread it and to amplify its impact. Despite the connection between them, these two characteristics have so far been considered in isolation. Here we aim to bridge this gap. In particular, we analyze the spread of propaganda and its interplay with coordinated behavior on a large Twitter dataset about the 2019 UK general election. We first propose and evaluate several metrics for measuring the use of propaganda on Twitter. Then, we investigate the use of propaganda by different coordinated communities that participated in the online debate. The combination of the use of propaganda and coordinated behavior allows us to uncover the *authenticity* and *harmfulness* of the different communities. Finally, we compare our measures of propaganda and coordination with automation (i.e., bot) scores and Twitter suspensions, revealing interesting trends. From a theoretical viewpoint, we introduce a methodology for analyzing several important dimensions of online behavior that are seldom jointly considered. From a practical viewpoint, we provide new insights into authentic and inauthentic online activities during the 2019 UK general election.

Introduction

Social media currently represent one of the main channels of information spread and consumption. They are increasingly used by a constantly growing share of the population to maintain active social relationships, to stay informed about socially relevant issues (e.g., politics, health), and to produce content, thus giving voice to the crowds. At the same time, a large portion of online information is biased, misleading, or outright fake. Moreover, such harmful content can be purposefully shared by malicious actors (e.g., social bots and trolls), and even by unaware users, with the aim to manipulate online audiences, to sow doubt and discord, and to increase polarization (Starbird, Arif, and Wilson 2019; Cresci 2020). The unprecedented importance of social media for information diffusion, combined with their vulnerability to organized misbehavior, sets the stage for online manipulation that can cause tremendous societal repercussions, as witnessed during the US Capitol Hill assault in January

2021 (Center for an Informed Public et al. 2021), and with the rampaging COVID-19 vaccine misinformation and disinformation (Ferrara, Cresci, and Luceri 2020).

Despite the differences between the broad array of tactics used to carry out online manipulation, many social media campaigns share two fundamental characteristics: (i) use of *propaganda* to influence those targeted by the manipulation (Bolsover and Howard 2017), and (ii) the adoption of *coordinated actions* to amplify the spread and outreach of the manipulation¹, in order to increase its impact. Given their importance for online manipulation, each of these characteristics has recently received scholarly attention. For example, computational linguists developed several AI solutions to automatically detect the use of propaganda techniques in news articles (Da San Martino et al. 2020a). Similarly, network science frameworks have been proposed for detecting coordinated groups of users (Pacheco et al. 2021) and for measuring the extent of coordination of online communities (Nizzoli et al. 2021). Despite recent progress, the study of computational propaganda and coordinated behavior is still in its early stages. As such, and in spite of the interrelationship between propaganda and coordinated behavior, so far, these two aspects have not been investigated jointly. Nonetheless, the combined analysis of propaganda and coordination is promising under multiple viewpoints:

- From a propaganda viewpoint, there already exist methods for detecting the use of rhetorical techniques to influence others (Da San Martino et al. 2019). However, there have been no studies to detect the **intent to harm** behind propaganda campaigns (Da San Martino et al. 2020a). *Coordination between users implies a shared intent*.
- From a coordination viewpoint, there already exist some methods for detecting coordinated users in social media (Nizzoli et al. 2021; Pacheco et al. 2021). However, distinguishing between **authentic** and **inauthentic** coordination is still an open challenge (Vargas, Emami, and Traynor 2020). *Propaganda implies the aim to mislead and to manipulate*. Thus, adding information about propaganda to the analysis of coordination can help distinguish authentic from inauthentic (i.e., harmful) behavior.

*Corresponding author.

Copyright © 2021, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

¹<http://about.fb.com/news/2018/12/inside-feed-coordinated-inauthentic-behavior/>

Contributions

We analyze the – so far unexplored – interplay between propaganda and coordination in the context of online debates. To reach this goal, we develop a methodological approach for carrying out analyses based on state-of-the-art techniques for detecting propaganda in texts and for measuring coordinated behavior in social media, and we apply it to studying a recent and relevant online debate on Twitter, about the 2019 UK general election.

In particular, we propose and experiment with several metrics for measuring the spread of propaganda by social media users and communities. We further carry out network analysis of coordinated online communities that participated in the electoral debate. Next, we combine our results on propaganda and coordination by comparing the spread of propaganda with the activity of coordinated communities. We also compare our results with clear signs of inauthenticity and harmfulness – namely, bot scores provided by Botometer (Sayyadiharikandeh et al. 2020) and Twitter suspensions. Our analysis provides more nuanced results compared to existing work, and it surfaces interesting patterns in the behavior of online communities that would not be visible otherwise. For instance, it allows to clearly identify and differentiate communities that exhibit opposite behaviors, such as (i) a malicious politically-oriented community, characterized by strongly coordinated users that are involved in spreading propaganda, and (ii) a grassroots community of activists protesting for women’s rights. Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We explore the interplay between propaganda and coordination in online debates, which so far have received little attention.
- By cross-checking propaganda and coordination, we get better insights into malicious behavior, thus moving in the direction of identifying and studying coordinated inauthentic behaviors (CIB) as well as propaganda campaigns.
- Regarding malicious behavior, we draw insights into the interplay between propaganda/coordination and automation/suspensions.
- From a practical standpoint, our analysis reveals interesting and nuanced characteristics of several online communities, which were previously unknown.

Related Work

The detection of propaganda and coordinated behavior have peculiar challenges that mandate the adoption of different analytical methods, such as techniques for natural language understanding for the detection of propaganda, and network science methods for the detection of coordination. For this reason, they have been the focus of disjoint efforts by different communities.

Coordinated Behavior

Coordinated behavior, be it authentic or not, is a relatively new concept proposed by Facebook in 2018 and later widely adopted in studies about online manipulation. Because of

its recency, the computational analysis of coordinated behavior poses several challenges. One is conceptual: What exactly is coordinated behavior? How many organized accounts, or how much coordination, is needed for meaningful coordinated behaviors to surface? Currently, there are no agreed-upon answers², which makes computational analysis problematic. In fact, many existing solutions still require a great deal of manual intervention (Starbird, Arif, and Wilson 2019).

Then, in the few computational frameworks that have been recently proposed, coordination was defined as an exceptional similarity between a number of users. Nizzoli et al. (2021) proposed a state-of-the-art pipeline organized in six analytical steps, starting with (i) selection of a set of users to investigate, (ii) selection of a metric with which to measure the similarity between users, (iii) construction of a weighted user-similarity network, (iv) network filtering, (v) coordination-aware community detection, and finally, (vi) analysis of the discovered coordinated communities. This approach is the only one so far that has proven capable of producing fine-grained estimates of the extent of coordination in the continuous $[0, 1]$ range, rather than a binary $\{0, 1\}$ classification of coordinated vs. non-coordinated communities. Examples of methods of the latter type include (Pacheco et al. 2021; Pacheco, Flammini, and Menczer 2020). Similarly to (Nizzoli et al. 2021), Pacheco et al. (2021) built a weighted user-similarity network. Then, they discarded all edges whose weight is below a given threshold, and clustered the remaining network to enable the discovery of coordinated communities. The drawback of this method, and similar ones (Giglietto et al. 2020), is the need to specify arbitrary thresholds to distinguish coordinated (i.e., above the threshold) from non-coordinated (i.e., below the threshold) behavior. Other methods do not embed a notion of coordination, but rather propose to apply community detection algorithms to weighted user-similarity networks, thus leaving the task of investigating coordinated communities for subsequent analysis (Weber and Neumann 2020, 2021).

Notably, in all previous work, coordination was detected or measured independently of authenticity. In fact, coordination does not necessarily imply malicious activities: think for instance of online fandoms, or other grassroots initiatives by activists, which are examples of coordinated authentic behavior. Vargas, Emami, and Traynor (2020) evaluated the capabilities of existing systems to distinguish between authentic and inauthentic coordination, finding unsatisfactory results and highlighting the difficulty of this task. To this end, in the remainder of this paper, we demonstrate that our combined analysis of coordination and propaganda allows to draw insights into the authenticity and harmfulness of online behavior, thus contributing to bridging this scientific gap.

Computational Propaganda

Work on propaganda detection has focused on analyzing textual documents (Barrón-Cedeño et al. 2019; Da San Martino

²<http://slate.com/technology/2020/07/coordinated-inauthentic-behavior-facebook-twitter.html>

hashtag	users	tweets
#GE2019	436,356	2,640,966
#GeneralElection19	104,616	274,095
#GeneralElection2019	240,712	783,805
#VoteLabour	201,774	917,936
#VoteLabour2019	55,703	265,899
#ForTheMany	17,859	35,621
#ForTheManyNotTheFew	22,966	40,116
#ChangelsComing	8,170	13,381
#RealChange	78,285	274,254
#VoteConservative	52,642	238,647
#VoteConservative2019	13,513	34,195
#BackBoris	36,725	157,434
#GetBrexItDone	46,429	168,911
total	668,312	4,983,499

Table 1: Statistics about data collected via hashtags.

et al. 2019; Rashkin et al. 2017), as summarized in a recent survey (Da San Martino et al. 2020a). Rashkin et al. (2017) developed a corpus with document-level annotations with four classes (*trusted*, *satire*, *hoax*, and *propaganda*), labeled using distant supervision: all articles from a given news outlet were assigned the label of that outlet. The news articles were collected from the English Gigaword corpus (which covers reliable news sources), as well as from seven unreliable news sources, including two propagandist ones. They trained a model using word n -grams, and found that it performed well only on articles from sources that the system was trained on, and that the performance degraded quite substantially when evaluated on articles from unseen news sources. Barrón-Cedeño et al. (2019) developed a corpus with two labels (i.e., propaganda vs. non-propaganda) and further investigated writing style and readability level. Their findings confirmed that using distant supervision, in conjunction with rich representations, might encourage the model to predict the source of the article, rather than to discriminate propaganda from non-propaganda. The studies by Habernal et al. (2017); Habernal, Pauli, and Gurevych (2018) also proposed a corpus with 1.3k arguments annotated with five fallacies that directly relate to propaganda techniques.

A more fine-grained propaganda analysis was done by Da San Martino et al. (2019), who developed a corpus of news articles annotated with the spans of use of eighteen propaganda techniques. They asked to predict the spans of use of propaganda, as well as the specific technique that is being used, and they further tackled a sentence-level propaganda detection task. They proposed a multi-granular gated deep neural network that captures signals from the sentence-level to improve the performance of the fragment-level classifier and vice versa. Subsequently, an online demo `Prta` was made publicly available (Da San Martino et al. 2020b).

Dataset

For our study we use the dataset from (Nizzoli et al. 2021). It contains 11,264,820 tweets about the 2019 UK general election, published by 1,179,659 distinct users. The data were

account	tweets	interactions	
		retweets	replies
@jeremycorbyn	788	1,759,823	414,158
@UKLabour	1,002	325,219	79,932
@BorisJohnson	454	284,544	382,237
@Conservatives	1,398	151,913	169,736
total	3,642	2,521,499	1,046,063

Table 2: Statistics about data collected from accounts.

collected between 12 November and 12 December (i.e., the election day) 2019, by means of Twitter Streaming APIs. In particular, the dataset contains all tweets using at least one of the election-related hashtags of Table 1. As shown, the hashtags used for data collection include both polarized (i.e., party-specific) hashtags as well as neutral ones. The dataset further contains all tweets shared by the two main parties (labour and conservative) and their leaders, as well as all interactions (i.e., retweets and replies) with such tweets, as summarized in Table 2. The final dataset for this study is the combination of the data shown in Tables 1 and 2, and quoted retweets (not counted in the tables). The dataset is publicly available for research purposes³.

In this work we extended the above Twitter dataset by also collecting and analyzing the textual content of all the news articles shared during the online electoral debate. To collect data about articles, we first parsed the 11M tweets, looking for URLs pointing to news outlets, blogs, or other news Web sites. Out of the entire Twitter dataset, we found 35,976 distinct articles from 3,974 Web sites, that were shared 329,482 times during the data collection period. Finally, we leveraged the *newspaper3k* Python package⁴ to collect the textual content, together with some metadata about each shared article.

Method

In this section, we describe the two main building blocks of our analysis: (i) the method for measuring coordination, and (ii) the propaganda classifier.

Measuring the Extent of Coordination

For measuring online coordination, we relied on the framework recently proposed in (Nizzoli et al. 2021), and briefly introduced in the related work section. For the first step of the framework (i.e., user selection), we constrained our analysis to *superspreaders* – namely, to the top 1% of users that shared the most retweets. Despite being only 10,782 users, superspreaders contributed to sharing 3.9M tweets, which account for 39% of the tweets and 44% of the retweets in our dataset. Their analysis is thus particularly relevant (Pei et al. 2014). Then, we measured the similarity between users in terms of co-retweets, in order to highlight users that frequently reshare the same messages. To reach this goal, for

³<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4647893>

⁴<http://newspaper.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>

each superspreader, we computed its TF.IDF-weighted vector of the tweet IDs that he/she has retweeted. The TF.IDF-weighting term allows to discount viral tweets by influencers and popular characters, and to emphasize retweets of unpopular tweets. Then, we computed the pairwise similarities between users as the cosine between their corresponding vectors. We filtered the resulting weighted user-similarity network by computing its multiscale backbone, a technique that allows to retain only statistically significant network structures (Serrano, Boguná, and Vespignani 2009). Finally, we applied the coordination-aware community detection algorithm proposed in (Nizzoli et al. 2021), which iteratively performs network dismantling based on increasingly restrictive user-similarity thresholds. In addition to detecting network communities, this last step also computes a coordination score in $[0, 1]$ for each user in the network, with 1 indicating maximum coordination.

Propaganda Detection

In order to assess whether a text is propagandistic, we used *Proppy*, a state-of-the-art system for detecting propagandistic articles (Barrón-Cedeño et al. 2019), which achieved an F_1 score of 82.89 on the $Q\text{-Prop}$ dataset. It uses a maximum entropy binary classifier with L_2 regularization for discriminating propagandistic vs. non-propagandistic news articles. It is trained on the $Q\text{Prop}$ corpus, consisting of 51k news articles from 94 non-propagandistic online sources and 10 propagandistic ones.⁵

Proppy represents an article using a large number of features, including (i) TF.IDF-weighted n -grams, (ii) frequency of specific words from a number of lexicons coming from Wiktionary, LIWC, Wilson’s subjectives, Hyland hedges, and Hooper’s assertives, (iii) writing style features such as TF.IDF-weighted character 3-grams, readability level and vocabulary richness (e.g., Flesch–Kincaid grade level, Flesch reading ease and the Gunning fog index), Type-Token Ratio (TTR), hapax legomena and dislegomena, and (iv) the NEws Landscape (NELA) features. The latter category includes 130 content-based features collected from the existing literature, which measure different aspects of a news article, comprising: sentiment, bias, morality, and complexity (Horne et al. 2018). Lexicon features are based on the analysis of the language of propaganda and trustworthy news, discussed in (Rashkin et al. 2017).

Analysis and Results

Below, we first carry out an analysis of coordinated communities, and we discuss the results and the limitations. We then combine these initial results with analysis of propaganda, and we conclude by showing how our approach helps to overcome the limitations of previous work.

Finding Coordinated Communities

We analyzed the coordinated clusters of users that took part in the online electoral debate, and we identified the follow-

⁵We obtain propaganda vs. non-propaganda categorization of media from the well-known *Media Bias/Fact Check* platform: <http://mediabiasfactcheck.com>

community	users	articles			tweets		
		#	# distinct	(%)	#	# distinct	(%)
LAB	5,213	79,157	5,861	(7.4%)	2,064,041	179,601	(8.7%)
CON	2,279	13,277	1,781	(13.4%)	777,537	76,191	(9.8%)
TVT	2,258	16,675	3,363	(20.2%)	690,900	62,058	(9.0%)
SNP	491	2,735	772	(28.2%)	140,338	8,601	(6.1%)
B60	296	3,231	789	(24.4%)	139,988	9,663	(6.9%)
ASE	107	706	396	(56.1%)	32,887	4,723	(14.4%)
LCH	101	150	57	(38.0%)	28,970	2,230	(7.7%)
overall	10,745	116,205	9,960	(8.6%)	3,886,382	343,750	(8.9%)

Table 3: Statistics, in terms of number of users and shared articles/tweets, about the seven communities that took part in the 2019 UK electoral debate on Twitter.

ing seven communities:

- LAB: A large community of labourists that support the Labour party and its leader Jeremy Corbyn, as well as traditional Labour themes such as healthcare and climate change.
- CON: A large community of conservative users. In addition to supporting the party and its leader Boris Johnson, this community is also strongly in favor of Brexit.
- TVT: A large community that includes several parties who teamed up with labourists against the conservative party (a strategy dubbed *tactical voting*).
- SNP: A medium-sized community of supporters of the Scottish National Party (SNP). These users also supported Scottish independence from the UK and asked for a new independence referendum.
- B60: A medium-to-small community of “Backto60” activists. Unlike the previous communities, these users do not represent a political party involved in the election. Instead, the B60 users leveraged the electoral debate to protest against a state pension age equalisation law that unfairly affected 4M women born in the 1950s⁶.
- ASE: A small community of conservative users. Despite sharing the same political orientation, these users are separated from the CON community because, rather than supporting the conservative party, they were mainly involved in attacking the labour party. An important narrative for ASE were antisemitism allegations targeted at labourists and Jeremy Corbyn throughout the electoral debate⁷.
- LCH: Another small community of activists. Similarly to B60, these users were not particularly interested in the electoral debate, but rather protested against a retrospective taxation called “loan charge” that forced certain people to return unsustainable amounts, which resulted in several suicides⁸.

Each of these communities has different goals, features different narratives, and shows diverse degrees of coordination⁹. In particular, we found both large and small communi-

⁶<http://pensionsage.com/pa/Backto60-granted-leave-to-appeal.php>

⁷<http://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/revealed-the-depth-of-labour-anti-semitism-bb57h9pdz>

⁸<http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/disguised-remuneration-independent-loan-charge-review/guidance>

⁹More details about these communities are in (Nizzoli et al. 2021).




Figure 1: Distribution of coordination scores for users of the different communities involved in the online debate.

ties, as reported in Table 3. While the larger communities are related to the main political parties involved in the election (e.g., LAB, CON, TVT, and SNP), the smaller ones represent other highly coordinated users that share a common goal, such as protesting activists (e.g., B60 and LCH) and political antagonists (e.g., ASE). The analysis of Table 3 also reveals a few differences in the sharing behaviors of the different communities. Overall, larger communities seem to share less original articles and tweets, compared to the smaller groups. This is indicative of top-down behaviors, where a small number of highly influential characters (e.g., the party leaders) drive the activities of the remaining members. In contrast, smaller communities seem to exhibit bottom-up behavior, characterized by grassroots activities and more content heterogeneity. This is particularly true for ASE, characterized by the largest % of original articles and tweets. The distribution of coordination scores for users of the different communities are shown in Figure 1. Again, different behavior and characteristics emerge for the different communities, and particularly, for the smaller ones. For instance, while B60 features users with diverse degrees of coordination, as shown by a relatively wide boxplot, LCH and SNP are much more homogeneous. B60 is also the community with the lowest degree of average coordination, in contrast to LCH and, to a lower extent, to ASE, SNP, and CON.

Discussion. Our results so far represent the state-of-the-art in the analysis of coordinated behavior (Nizzoli et al. 2021; Pacheco et al. 2021; Weber and Neumann 2020). On the one hand, this approach allows us to obtain nuanced results in terms of coordinated communities. In fact, it allows to detect several groups of coordinated users, both large and small, thus yielding more informative results with respect to coarser analyses that only focus on the two main factions involved in an online debate (e.g., right vs. left, Democrats vs. Republicans, etc.), as done in (Conover et al. 2011; Garimella et al. 2017). Furthermore, it surfaces different patterns of coordination (e.g., top-down vs. bottom-up). This approach to the analysis of coordinated behavior allows us to obtain nuanced and fine-grained results, typical of studies that require a great deal of offline, manual investigations (Starbird, Arif, and Wilson 2019; Assenmacher et al. 2020), while still retaining the advantages of large-scale, au-

tomated analysis.

On the other hand, these results do not give insights into the inauthenticity and the harmfulness of the coordinated communities. In other words, it is still not possible to clearly identify which communities (if any) exploited coordination for tampering with the 2019 UK electoral debate on Twitter, and which instead represent neutral or well-intentioned coordinated users. Our subsequent analysis contributes to answering this question.

Measuring Propaganda on Social Media

Our dataset contains two sources of textual content that possibly convey propaganda: shared (*i*) articles and (*ii*) tweets. However, all propaganda detection systems proposed so far – including `Proppy`, the one used in our analysis – were solely developed and tested for analyzing news articles (Da San Martino et al. 2020a). The first decision necessary to compute propaganda scores on social media is about which items (i.e., articles vs. tweets) to classify with `Proppy`. Although the system is designed for news articles, from Table 3 we notice that our dataset features, on average, < 1 original article per user and ≈ 32 original tweets per user. Thus, when computing propaganda scores at the user level, we might end up with sparse and unreliable results, if we base our scores on articles. Moreover, the original tweets are authored by the users themselves, contrarily to articles that are just reshared. Hence, tweets represent a more direct way of measuring user’s propaganda.

For these reasons, we computed propaganda scores based on both articles and tweets, and we later compared them. For classifying articles, we used `Proppy` with the same configuration proposed by its authors in (Barrón-Cedeño et al. 2019). For classifying tweets, we made adjustments to account for the differences between news articles and tweets. Specifically, several features used in `Proppy` are influenced by document length, and tweets are obviously much shorter than articles. Because of this, we did not classify single tweets, but we grouped all original (meaning no retweets) tweets by the same author into chunks whose length was comparable to that of the articles used to train `Proppy`.

Thus, the propaganda score for user j is obtained as,

$$P_u(u_j) = \Psi(P(i_k)) \quad \forall i_k \text{ shared by } u_j,$$

where Ψ is the user-level aggregation function; i_k are all chunks of original tweets, or all distinct news articles, shared by u_j ; and $P(i_k)$ are `Proppy`’s classifications of such items. Finally, since we want to compare different communities, we aggregate the user scores for each community. The propaganda score of the i -th community c_i is computed as

$$P_c(c_i) = \Phi(P_u(u_j)) \quad \forall u_j \in c_i,$$

where Φ is the community-level aggregation function. The combination of the possible items (i.e., articles or tweets) and of different aggregation functions Ψ and Φ , leads to 24 propaganda metrics, a subset of which we show in Table 4.

The Spread of Propaganda by Coordinated Users

Combining coordination and propaganda. So far, our approach provided us with three pieces of information that we




Figure 2: Examples of the relationship between propaganda and coordination that are conveyed by some of the propaganda metrics. Informative metrics (M_1 and M_2 in panels (a) and (b)) capture the differences between communities, while less informative ones (M_{23} and M_{24} in panels (c) and (d)) show similar, mostly flat, trends for all communities.




Figure 3: Distribution of propaganda scores for the users in our dataset. The metric is based on tweets and weighted median for user-level aggregation (M_1 in Table 4).

can combine: (i) coordination scores, (ii) propaganda scores, and (iii) communities. By combining community labels with coordination and propaganda scores, we are able to study the trends of propaganda as a function of coordination, for each community. Let $C_u(u_j)$ be the coordination score of the j -th user u_j , the propaganda score of community c_i as a function of coordination is,

$$P_c(c_i, k) = \Phi(P_u(u_j)) \forall u_j \in c_i : C_u(u_j) \geq k. \quad (1)$$

In other words, Equation (1) defines how to compute a propaganda score at different coordination thresholds k , for each community. Therefore, we are able to assess whether the most coordinated users in each community, were also the most propagandistic ones. In turn, this provides valuable information for assessing the *authenticity* and the *harmfulness* (or lack thereof) of the different communities. Figure 2 shows examples of this analysis obtained by applying Equation (1) at different levels of coordination, for some of the propaganda metrics from Table 4.

Choosing a suitable propaganda metric. Out of all the possible metrics summarized in Table 4, we need to choose

#	item	user-level	community-level	informativeness (I)
		aggregation (Ψ)	aggregation (Φ)	
M_1	🐦	weighted median	mean	0.5491
M_2	🐦	majority voting	mean	0.5457
M_3	🐦	majority voting	ratio	0.5457
M_4	🐦	weighted median	ratio	0.5442
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
M_{10}	📰	weighted median	mean	0.5156
M_{11}	📰	majority voting	mean	0.4990
M_{12}	📰	majority voting	ratio	0.4990
M_{13}	🐦	weighted median	median	0.4955
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
M_{21}	📰	weighted median	ratio	0.4475
M_{22}	🐦	max	mean	0.4400
M_{23}	🐦	max	ratio	0.4400
M_{24}	📰	weighted median	median	0.4214

🐦: tweets, 📰: articles

Table 4: Subset of all propaganda metrics that we can compute, starting from shared articles or tweets. Metrics are shown in descending order of informativeness.

one that provides valuable information for distinguishing propagandistic vs. non-propagandistic groups of users. That is, we are interested in a propaganda metric that is capable of highlighting the differences between the several communities involved in the online electoral debate. We quantitatively measured the *informativeness*, I , of each propaganda metric based on the differences between the propaganda trends that it produces for each community. In particular, for any given metric, we computed the average of the Pearson’s correlations r between the propaganda trends $P_c(c_x, k)$, $P_c(c_y, k)$ of each possible pair of communities c_x and c_y ,

$$\bar{r} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x, y : x \neq y}^N r(P_c(c_x, k), P_c(c_y, k))$$

Then, the informativeness is defined as follows: $I = \frac{1-\bar{r}}{2}$. Intuitively, if a metric produces large *positive* correlation between propaganda community trends, then $\bar{r} \approx 1$ and $I \approx 0$.

community	coordination	automation	suspensions	δ (%)
LAB	-0.193	0.428 *	0.925 ***	-0.016 (-6.5%)
CON	-0.754 ***	-0.688 ***	-0.079	-0.008 (-3.0%)
TVT	0.813 ***	0.836 ***	0.844 ***	+0.074 (+26.0%)
SNP	-0.404 *	0.358	0.902 ***	-0.031 (-13.5%)
B60	-0.899 ***	-0.961 ***	0.882 ***	-0.070 (-36.7%)
ASE	0.742 ***	0.762 ***	-0.218	+0.026 (+9.7%)
LCH	0.562 ***	0.704 ***	-0.733 ***	+0.014 (+20.7%)
overall	-0.679 ***	-0.285	-0.052	-
	(a)	(b)	(c)	

***: $p < 0.01$, **: $p < 0.05$, *: $p < 0.1$

Table 5: Correlation analysis between propaganda scores and (a) coordination scores, (b) automation scores, and (c) Twitter suspensions; for all communities.

This means that such a metric is not able to diversify the behavior of the different communities, as reflected by the low informativeness. Conversely, if a metric produces large *negative* correlations between propaganda community trends, then $\bar{r} \approx -1$ and $I \approx 1$, meaning that the metric is able to diversify the different communities.

The last column of Table 4 reports the informativeness of each possible propaganda metric, with M_1 being the most informative one. As shown in Figure 2, informative metrics (e.g., M_1 , M_2) yield diverse propaganda trends for the different communities, while less informative ones (e.g., M_{23} , M_{24}) yield similar trends for all communities. Furthermore, all informative metrics, such as M_1 and M_2 depicted in Figures 2a and 2b, yield qualitatively similar trends, meaning that changing the metric would not alter the results of our analysis. Following these results, all our subsequent analyses are based on M_1 . The distribution of propaganda scores based on M_1 is shown in Figure 3.

Results. Figure 2a shows the relationship between propaganda and coordination, for the different communities. In this figure, different line-types and transparencies are used to indicate the number of users in each community, at different levels of coordination. In fact, each community has a different cardinality, as reported in Table 3. Moreover, fewer users are considered when moving toward large coordination values (i.e., only the most coordinated ones). Figure 2a shows that, for each community, we always have > 10 users, with all the tweets they shared, even at coordination ≈ 1 . Furthermore, we always have ≥ 50 users when coordination ≤ 0.8 . Given that our propaganda scores are derived from tweets, this ensures that the propaganda trends shown in figure are not derived from a trivial number of tweets.

Figure 2a shows interesting trends for some communities. First, LCH is characterized by the lowest degree of propaganda among all communities. Similarly, B60 shows a marked decreasing propaganda trend, implying that the core users of the community (i.e., the most coordinated ones) are not engaged in propaganda. Both these findings represent evidence of harmless behaviors. In other words, LCH appears to be highly coordinated, as shown in Figure 1, but harmless. B60 features diverse degrees of coor-

dination among its users, but is nonetheless harmless. On the contrary, other communities feature increasing propaganda trends – above all, TVT and ASE. For coordination ≥ 0.5 , both show increasing levels of propaganda, which supports the hypothesis of harmful communities. For the remaining three communities (i.e., LAB, CON, and SNP) coordination appears to be mostly unrelated to propaganda. These qualitative findings are confirmed by the quantitative results reported in Table 5a. In detail, a correlation analysis shows strong, positive, and statistically significant Pearson correlations between propaganda and coordination for TVT and ASE, with $r = 0.813$ and $r = 0.742$, respectively. Instead, B60 features a strong, negative, and statistically significant correlation $r = -0.899$. The remaining results in Table 5 are not meaningful, either because of small correlations or low statistical significance (LAB, SNP, and LCH), or because of limited variation of propaganda (CON). About the latter, Pearson correlation measures the strength of the linear relationship between two variables, but it does not measure the extent of variation for either variables, which is relevant in our analysis. The last column of Table 5 accounts for this by measuring the variation in propaganda as $\delta = P_c(c_i, k = 0.9) - P_c(c_i, k = 0)$, for each community c_i . Despite featuring a marked negative and significant correlation, CON only exhibits a very small propaganda $\delta = -0.008$, represented in Figure 2a by a mostly flat line.


Discussion. Given the lack of ground-truth on coordinated harmful vs. harmless behaviors, one way to qualitatively validate our analysis is by cross-checking our results with previous work and with the role of the communities in the electoral debate. Two communities emerged as authentic and harmless: LCH and B60. This means that, according to our proposed methodology, their activities are coordinated, but not malicious nor deceptive. In other words, they exhibit coordinated but authentic and harmless behavior. From previous work (Nizzoli et al. 2021) and from our analysis of coordinated communities, we find that these are groups of activists protesting against unfair taxations (LCH) and in favor of women’s rights (B60). Table 6 provides a detailed look at some of the tweets from B60’s highly coordinated users, confirming that their focus was promoting their cause as well as encouraging women to exercise their right to vote. In addition, they did a generous amount of endorsement for the Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn, who expressed support for their initiative. Hence, our methodology correctly highlighted activists as harmless examples of grassroots coordination. Instead, our analysis revealed that TVT and ASE feature characteristics related to harmful behaviors. Both are highly polarized communities with strong political motivations. Regarding TVT and its highly coordinated members, Table 6 shows that the majority of their tweets and shared articles are politically themed. Most of the time they attack Boris Johnson and the conservatives. Similarly, although at the opposite of the political spectrum, ASE’s peculiarity was that of repeatedly attacking the Labour party and its leader with allegations of antisemitism. Here, our methodology highlighted aggressive communities as harmful. Finally, LAB, CON, and SNP appear as neither markedly harmless nor harmful. Again, this is in line with the role of these com-

munities in the electoral debate, since they are large communities of moderate users (Nizzoli et al. 2021).

We further inspected the framing of the articles shared by different communities. We used the frame inventory of the Media Frames Corpus (Card et al. 2015), and performed automatic annotation of the frames using the Tanbih API.¹⁰ Figure 5 shows analysis for four frames: we can see differences across the frames, even within a single community. For example, the *Political* frame evolves into propagandistic behavior as coordination increases, e.g., for TVT; conversely, for *Policy Prescription*, the propaganda score decreases. This suggests that, when not in excess, spreading propaganda could be an individual occurrence and not an accurate characterization of the community. Moreover, we see how different communities deviate from the rest in terms of overall propagandistic content, e.g., SNP and TVT maintain a relatively high propaganda score of 0.45–0.60 for *Public Opinion*, compared to the rest (in 0.15–0.25).

Comparisons. Here, we discuss our methodology and results in comparison to previous work, highlighting the usefulness and the advantages of our approach. Several earlier attempts at detecting inauthentic and harmful campaigns only investigated coordination and synchronization between accounts (Pacheco et al. 2021; Sharma, Ferrara, and Liu 2020; Weber and Neumann 2020). In their work, all groups of users exhibiting unexpected coordination were considered as malicious (Pacheco et al. 2021). Despite representing an initial solution to the task of detecting malicious campaigns, this approach has a number of drawbacks. For example, if applied to our dataset, it would have flagged the LCH community as malicious, due to its extreme degree of coordination, as is visible in Figure 1. However, our nuanced analysis of propaganda and coordination revealed that the LCH users are protesting activists – a finding also confirmed by Nizzoli et al. (2021). Conversely, the TVT community features the second-lowest degree of coordination among our communities. As such, it would have been labeled as non-suspicious. However, our analysis revealed a strong positive correlation between propaganda and coordination for TVT users, uncovering their malicious intent. In summary, our results show that coordination alone does not provide enough information for assessing the real activities and intent of online communities. Instead, a methodology combining the analysis of coordination with signs of malicious intent (e.g., propaganda), such as the proposed one, can tell inauthentic and harmful behaviors apart from authentic and harmless ones.

Our findings also confirm and extend previous results on the role of small and fringe Web communities in information disorder. Zannettou et al. (2017, 2018) noted that fringe, polarized, and strongly motivated communities are those that exert the most influence on the Web for issues such as disinformation and online abuse, despite being relatively small in size. In our analysis, we obtained comparable results. Indeed, the most interesting communities (i.e., those that exhibit coordinated yet markedly harmless or harmful behavior) are small and non-mainstream, such as LCH, B60, and ASE. However, while Zannettou et al. investigated this phe-



(a) Propaganda vs. automation. (b) Propaganda vs. suspensions.

Figure 4: Trends of propaganda versus trends of automation scores and suspensions, for relevant communities.

nomenon *across* Web platforms, here we show that the same also occurs *within* platforms, as part of online debates.

Inauthentic and Harmful Behavior

We conclude our analysis by comparing propaganda and coordination scores with other clear signs of inauthenticity and harmfulness. We leverage automation (i.e., bots) scores as a proxy for inauthenticity. For each account, we use the maximum of Botometer’s English and universal scores, both provided in the $[0, 1]$ range, as its automation score (Sayyadiharikandeh et al. 2020). Similarly, we investigate the number of accounts suspended by Twitter in each community, as a proxy for harmfulness. Table 5, columns (b) and (c), reports correlation results between our propaganda scores versus automation and Twitter suspensions, respectively. By cross-checking strong and significant correlations against notable variations in propaganda (δ), we highlight interesting trends. Regarding automation, the same communities that featured a strong positive correlation between propaganda and coordination – namely, TVT and ASE – are also strongly correlated with automation scores. This means that highly coordinated users in TVT and ASE are both inauthentic and harmful, further confirming our earlier results. An unexpected result is instead obtained for B60, which features a strong negative correlation between propaganda and automation. In other words, while propaganda decreases as a function of coordination, automation scores increase. Thus, coordinated B60 users could be leveraging automation as a way to boost their online actions. Propaganda and automation trends for TVT, ASE, and B60 are shown in Figure 4a. Regarding Twitter suspensions, we measure a strong positive correlation for the TVT community. Overall, TVT appears as the most harmful community in the whole online electoral debate, with high propaganda, automation and the largest share of accounts suspended by Twitter. Strong positive correlation between propaganda and suspension trends are also measured for B60 and SNP. Since, for these communities, propaganda was decreasing with coordination, these positive correlations mean that Twitter suspensions are also decreasing, which is a sign of harmless behavior. This result is particularly relevant for B60, and it corroborates our previous findings. Trends of propaganda and suspensions for SNP, TVT, and B60 are shown in Figure 4b.

¹⁰<http://app.swaggerhub.com/apis/yifan2019/Tanbih/0.8.0/#/>




Figure 5: Frame analysis of the articles shared by different communities. Propaganda is measured as the fraction of articles in a certain frame flagged as propagandist, out of all articles from that frame. Line styles indicate the number of tweets.

Conclusion and Future Work

We carried out the first combined analysis of propaganda and coordination for studying online debates. Specifically, we applied our methodology to the 2019 UK electoral debate on Twitter, revealing (i) harmful, (ii) neutral, and (iii) well-intentioned communities that took part in the debate. Among the most harmful communities, we found “tactical voters” colluded against conservatives (TVT) and a small group of political antagonists that attacked labourists and Jeremy Corbyn with accusations of antisemitism (ASE). Among the harmless coordinated communities, we uncovered groups of activists protesting against loan taxation (LCH) and in favor of women’s rights (B60). Besides providing novel and interesting insights into the communities that participated in the 2019 UK online electoral debate, our results also demonstrate the need to combine analysis of coordinated behavior and intent. In fact, our methodology allowed us to distinguish between coordinated *harmful* and *harmless* behavior, thus overcoming one of the main limitations of earlier work.

Among the future challenges along this important research direction, is the construction of a reliable ground-truth of coordinated harmful and harmless behavior. This endeavor would allow shifting from the current descriptive work to predictions, by training machine learning models capable of automatically detecting harmful behavior. We also plan to collect and to investigate additional information about online communities, thus going beyond the analysis of coordination and propaganda. If successful, these efforts will allow a deeper understanding of coordinated online behavior, enabling the possibility to rapidly intervene in cases of harmful behavior, and ultimately limiting the spread, the influence, and the impact of information disorders.

References

- Assenmacher, D.; Clever, L.; Pohl, J. S.; Trautmann, H.; and Grimme, C. 2020. A Two-Phase Framework for Detecting Manipulation Campaigns in Social Media. In *SCSM’20*.
- Barrón-Cedeño et al., A. 2019. Proppy: Organizing the news based on their propagandistic content. *Inf. Process. Manag.* 56(5): 1849–1864.
- Bolsover, G.; and Howard, P. 2017. Computational Propaganda and Political Big Data: Moving Toward a More Critical Research Agenda. *Big Data* 5(4): 273–276.
- Card, D.; Boydston, A. E.; Gross, J. H.; Resnik, P.; and Smith, N. A. 2015. The Media Frames Corpus: Annotations of Frames Across Issues. In *ACL-IJCLP*, 438–444.
- Center for an Informed Public; Digital Forensic Research Lab; Graphika; and Stanford Internet Observatory. 2021. The Long Fuse: Misinformation and the 2020 Election. *Stanford Digital Repository: Election Integrity Partnership* URL <https://purl.stanford.edu/tr171zs0069>.
- Conover, M.; Ratkiewicz, J.; Francisco, M.; Gonçalves, B.; Menczer, F.; and Flammini, A. 2011. Political polarization on twitter. In *AAAI ICWSM*.
- Cresci, S. 2020. A decade of social bot detection. *Communications of the ACM* 63(10): 72–83.
- Da San Martino, G.; Cresci, S.; Barrón-Cedeño, A.; Yu, S.; Di Pietro, R.; and Nakov, P. 2020a. A survey on computational propaganda detection. In *IJCAI*, 4826–4832.
- Da San Martino, G.; Shaar, S.; Zhang, Y.; Yu, S.; Barrón-Cedeño, A.; and Nakov, P. 2020b. Prta: A system to support the analysis of propaganda techniques in the news. In *ACL*.
- Da San Martino, G.; Yu, S.; Barrón-Cedeño, A.; Petrov, R.; and Nakov, P. 2019. Fine-Grained Analysis of Propaganda in News Articles. In *EMNLP*.
- Ferrara, E.; Cresci, S.; and Luceri, L. 2020. Misinformation, manipulation and abuse on social media in the era of COVID-19. *Journal of Computational Social Science* 3.
- Garimella, K.; De Francisci Morales, G.; Gionis, A.; and Mathioudakis, M. 2017. Reducing controversy by connecting opposing views. In *ACM WSDM*.
- Giglietto, F.; Righetti, N.; Rossi, L.; and Marino, G. 2020. It takes a village to manipulate the media: coordinated link sharing behavior during 2018 and 2019 Italian elections. *Information, Communication & Society* 1–25.
- Habernal, I.; Hannemann, R.; Pollak, C.; Klamm, C.; Pauli, P.; and Gurevych, I. 2017. Argotario: Computational Argumentation Meets Serious Games. In *EMNLP*.

	Tweet Text	Article Title
TVT	Join @fckboris & #RegisterToVote #GE2019 <url>	Five ways to say Fck Boris
	GE2019: Five ways to say F**k Boris #GeneralElection2019#Brexit#VoteToriesOut <url>	Five ways to say Fck Boris
	KARMA: Katie Hopkins forced to sell £1m home and now rents after cringe libel loss / #GE2019 #Brexit <url>	Katie Hopkins forced to sell £1m home and now rents after humiliating libel case
	Here is vocal #RemainerNow and life long Tory voter @OborneTweets on #GE2019 <url>	As a lifelong Conservative, here's why I can't vote for Boris Johnson
	Boris Johnson unfit to be Prime Minister. Brexit damages the Henley constituency - John Howell MP knows this but continues his support- @LauracoyleLD Laura Coyle the People's Vote recommendation <url>	I was Boris Johnson's boss: he is utterly unfit to be prime minister
	#TacticalVoting #PeoplesVote #Boris #GeneralElection2019	
	This is beyond desperate and beyond tin pot banana republic actions if true. #GE2019 <url>	General election: Farage claims No 10 offered Brexit Party candidates jobs to stand down
	I'm voting Labour for the final say on Brexit. Share why you're voting Labour Right #VoteLabour <url>	I'm Voting Labour...
	I'm voting Labour for a million green jobs. Share why you're voting Labour #VoteLabour <url>	I'm Voting Labour...
	WASPI Women won't be silenced #GeneralElection2019 <url> via @WASPI.Campaign	WASPI Women won't be silenced #GeneralElection2019
B60	Owen Jones: 'They don't want you to vote. Defy them' #GTTO #GeneralElection2019 <url> Sent via @updayUK	Owen Jones: 'They don't want you to vote. Defy them'
	Well done May from Falkirk Waspi. <url> #waspicampaign2018 #deedsnotwords #onevoice #GeneralElection2019	WASPI woman puts Boris Johnson on spot about trust after he publicly pledged to try and sort out pension row during visit to Cheltenham
	Now that most party manifestos have been published, join @WASPI.Campaign today at <url> and find your nearest local group at <url> to find out about our #GE2019 Toolkit so you can speak up for #WASPI in your local area #WASPIwomenvote	How to join WASPI

Table 6: Excerpt of the activity of strongly coordinated ($k \geq 0.9$) members of TVT and B60. While TVT users attack Boris Johnson and Brexit, B60 users are encouraging women to vote and are supporting the WASPI (Women Against State Pension Inequality) campaign. All TVT tweets in table are labeled as propagandist, while all B60 tweets are labeled as non-propagandist.

Habernal, I.; Pauli, P.; and Gurevych, I. 2018. Adapting Serious Game for Fallacious Argumentation to German: Pitfalls, Insights, and Best Practices. In *LREC*.

Horne, B. D.; Dron, W.; Khedr, S.; and Adali, S. 2018. Sampling the News Producers: A Large News and Feature Data Set for the Study of the Complex Media Landscape. In *AAAI ICWSM*.

Nizzoli, L.; Tardelli, S.; Avvenuti, M.; Cresci, S.; and Tesconi, M. 2021. Coordinated behavior on social media in 2019 UK general election. In *AAAI ICWSM*.

Pacheco, D.; Flammini, A.; and Menczer, F. 2020. Unveiling Coordinated Groups Behind White Helmets Disinformation. In *WWW Companion*.

Pacheco, D.; Hui, P.-M.; Torres-Lugo, C.; Truong, B. T.; Flammini, A.; and Menczer, F. 2021. Uncovering coordinated networks on social media: Methods and case studies. In *AAAI ICWSM*.

Pei, S.; Muchnik, L.; Andrade Jr, J. S.; Zheng, Z.; and Makse, H. A. 2014. Searching for superspreaders of information in real-world social media. *Scientific reports* 4: 5547.

Rashkin, H.; Choi, E.; Jang, J. Y.; Volkova, S.; and Choi, Y. 2017. Truth of Varying Shades: Analyzing Language in Fake News and Political Fact-Checking. In *EMNLP*.

Sayyadiharikandeh, M.; Varol, O.; Yang, K.-C.; Flammini, A.; and Menczer, F. 2020. Detection of novel social bots by ensembles of specialized classifiers. In *ACM CIKM*.

Serrano, M. Á.; Boguná, M.; and Vespignani, A. 2009. Ex-

tracting the multiscale backbone of complex weighted networks. *PNAS* 106(16).

Sharma, K.; Ferrara, E.; and Liu, Y. 2020. Identifying coordinated accounts in disinformation campaigns. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.11308*.

Starbird, K.; Arif, A.; and Wilson, T. 2019. Disinformation as Collaborative Work: Surfacing the Participatory Nature of Strategic Information Operations. In *ACM CSCW*.

Vargas, L.; Emami, P.; and Traynor, P. 2020. On the detection of disinformation campaign activity with network analysis. In *ACM CCSW*, 133–146.

Weber, D.; and Neumann, F. 2020. Who's in the Gang? Revealing Coordinating Communities in Social Media. In *IEEE/ACM ASONAM*.

Weber, D.; and Neumann, F. 2021. A General Method to Find Highly Coordinating Communities in Social Media through Inferred Interaction Links. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03409*.

Zannettou, S.; Caulfield, T.; Blackburn, J.; De Cristofaro, E.; Sirivianos, M.; Stringhini, G.; and Suarez-Tangil, G. 2018. On the origins of memes by means of fringe web communities. In *ACM IMC*.

Zannettou, S.; Caulfield, T.; De Cristofaro, E.; Kourtellis, N.; Leontiadis, I.; Sirivianos, M.; Stringhini, G.; and Blackburn, J. 2017. The web centipede: understanding how web communities influence each other through the lens of mainstream and alternative news sources. In *ACM IMC*.