

Are We All in a Truman Show? Spotting Instagram Crowdturfing through Self-Training

Pier Paolo Tricomi,¹ Sousan Tarahomi,² Christian Cattai,¹ Francesco Martini,¹ Mauro Conti¹

¹University of Padova, Italy

²Imam Reza University, Iran

tricomi@math.unipd.it, s1.tarahomi@gmail.com, christian.cattai@studenti.unipd.it, francesco.martini.11@studenti.unipd.it, conti@math.unipd.it

Abstract

In 2021, Influencer Marketing generated more than \$13 billion. Companies and major brands advertise their products on Social Media, especially Instagram, through Influencers, i.e., people with high popularity and the ability to influence the mass. Usually, more popular and visible influencers are paid more for their collaborations. As a result, many services were born to boost profiles' popularity, engagement, or visibility, mainly through bots or fake accounts. Researchers have focused on recognizing such unnatural activities in different social networks with high success. However, real people recently started participating in such boosting activities using their real accounts for monetary rewards, generating ungenue content that is very difficult to detect. Currently, on Instagram, no works have tried to detect this new phenomenon, known as crowdturfing (CT).

In this work, we are the first to propose a CT engagement detector on Instagram. Our algorithm leverages profiles' characteristics through semi-supervised learning to spot accounts involved in CT activities. In contrast to the supervised methods employed so far to detect fake accounts, a semi-supervised approach takes advantage of the vast quantities of unlabeled data on social media to yield better results. We purchased and studied 1293 CT profiles from 11 providers to build our self-training classifier, which reached 95% accuracy. Finally, we ran our model in the wild to detect and analyze the CT engagement of 20 mega-influencers (i.e., with more than one million followers), discovering that more than 20% of their engagement was artificial. We analyzed the profiles and comments of people involved in CT engagement, showing how difficult it is to spot these activities using only the generated content.

1 Introduction

Instagram (IG) is the most popular photo-sharing app, with around one billion monthly active users (Statista 2021). Features like online self-expression and the display of wealth through pictures make Instagram a suitable platform for numerous celebrities and influencers' brand endorsements. This situation has given rise to social media marketing and, consequently, to the manipulation of the market to increase revenue, making influencers unreliable (Statista 2021; Liao et al. 2021). Many providers offer services on Instagram to

boost the visibility and fame of a specific account, for example, by increasing the number of followers, likes, and comments. If bots or fake accounts initially conducted these activities, nowadays, real people use their accounts to do such services, behind a monetary reward. In the literature, this phenomenon is called crowdturfing (CT), a term that combines the collaboration of many individuals (crowdsourcing (Martin et al. 2008)) with an apparently natural action controlled by agencies (astroturfing (Wang et al. 2012)). Since the engagement generated from CT is not real, we can name this occurrence as fake. Fake engagement damages the authenticity of social media and can create threats such as brand abuse, fraud, and followers farming (Zarei et al. 2020).

To the best of our knowledge, there are no works that detect CT activities on Instagram. Indeed, researchers have focused on detecting bots or fake accounts explicitly created for fake engagement, but they never dealt with real profiles of real people engaging in CT. In this work, we try to close this gap by proposing a new algorithm to detect profiles involved in CT and, accordingly, their activities. To spot fake engagement derived from CT, a suitable approach is to first detect the involved accounts. Prior works on bots and fake accounts detection show that machine learning-based solutions are the most powerful and cost-effective techniques (Orabi et al. 2020). Therefore, to detect CT accounts, we opt to use machine learning too. However, while the majority of proposed ML algorithms for account classification leverage supervised learning, there is always the need for an adequately labeled ground truth, which is inherently difficult to obtain for CT activities (Song, Lee, and Kim 2015). Instead, semi-supervised methods could be more appropriate in such situation, in which only a few labeled samples are needed, and a large amount of unlabeled data can help to improve the classification without impacting the performance (Shi et al. 2017).

Contribution. The contribution of the paper can be summarized as follows:

- We are the first, to the best of our knowledge, to propose a CT engagement detector on Instagram, closing the gap between simple bots and fake accounts detection (prior works) and CT-involved accounts (our work);
- We employ semi-supervised algorithms to classify fake accounts, which is a new approach on Instagram;
- We provide a detailed analysis of CT providers to explore

the services they offer and the profiles involved;

- We study the Instagram CT engagement in the wild, mainly related to comments, by running our detector on 1000 posts generated by 20 mega-influencers.

Structure. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents related works. Sections 3 and 4 show the methodology and CT providers analysis, respectively. Section 5 contains the details of our CT profiles detection mechanism. The analysis of CT profiles and CT comments spotted in the wild are presented in Sections 6 and 7, respectively. Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 Related Works

In this section, we give a brief overview of semi-supervised approaches for account classification in social media (Sec. 2.1) and fake accounts and CT discovery on Instagram and other social media (Sec. 2.2).

2.1 Semi-supervised learning for account classification

Most of the semi-supervised fake detection approaches on social media targeted Sybil Nodes or Bots. SybilBelief (Gong et al. 2014) is a semi-supervised learning framework for finding Sybil nodes such as spammers and impersonators. It models social networks like Facebook as Markov Random Fields (MRFs) and adopts Loopy Belief Propagation (LBP) to iteratively propagate the reputations from labeled to unlabeled nodes. Ren et al. (2018) proposed a semi-supervised approach to detect spammers on Sina Weibo by using behavior and content features. Their method takes advantage of social graph models and co-training. SybilTrap (Al-Qurishi et al. 2018) uses label propagation random walk as a semi-supervised transductive-learning approach to detect malicious users. This approach focuses on both structural and content-based features. Dorri et al. (2018) developed SocialBotHunter as a semi-supervised collective classification technique to detect social bots in Twitter-like platforms. Their approach uses the social behavior and interaction of users. Alharthi et al. (2019) employed Label propagation and Label spreading algorithms as semi-supervised techniques to detect singles and groups of Arab spammers on Twitter based on their behavior and profile data. Shi et al. (2019) analyzed user behaviors such as liking, commenting, and sharing and calculated transition probability features of clickstreams based on time interval features, using semi-supervised clustering to detect social bots. Last, SEMIPSM (Alvari, Shaabani, and Shakarian 2021) is a semi-supervised Laplacian SVM model using manifold regularization to discover users who are responsible for propagating misinformation on social media.

2.2 Fake and CT accounts detection

There are several works that deal with fake profiles or bots on Instagram, however, they did not consider CT activities. Thejas et al. (2019) developed a ML model to detect fake likes on Instagram, deploying honeypots and botnets to collect the ground truth. They employed ML methods to find the authenticity of likers with features includ-

ing the number of followers, following, and their relationships. To detect fake and automated Instagram accounts, the authors in (Akyon and Kalfaoglu 2019) applied a set of different ML algorithms on posts and media-related features, obtaining 86% and 94% accuracy for automated and fake accounts, respectively. In (Sheikhi 2020), the authors used bagged decision trees on profile-related features to detect trivial (manually-labeled) fake users. Zarei et al. (2020) applied clustering methods to track down impersonators in three different categories based on their profile similarity. In (Purba, Asirvatham, and Murugesan 2020), the authors tried to detect three categories of fake accounts: active, inactive, and spammers. They bought the fake accounts from Indonesian providers; however, most of them were simple bots, not linked to CT activities. They reached 92% of accuracy using Random Forest. Kim and Hany (2020) proposed a neural network to detect engagement bots by three sets of features, including text, behavior, and graph-based features.

To spot crowdturfing on social media, Wang et al. (2012) first did an investigation on two popular crowd-sourcing sites in china and tracked down the CT campaigns on Sina Weibo. Then, they discussed the characteristics of CT and genuine Weibo accounts and analyzed in detail the CT campaigns. Another work on Sina Weibo (Yang, Yang, and Wilson 2015) analyzed CT accounts engaging in political activities, claiming their methodology could not find any clear evidence to show the presence of large-scale political CT on Weibo. In (Lee, Webb, and Ge 2014), the authors categorized different types of CT tasks by considering Fiverr, a marketplace for small jobs, and applied ML algorithms to distinguish these tasks from legitimate ones. Song et al. (2015) were able to spot targets of CT tasks such as posts, pages, and URLs, on Twitter, with a false-positive rate of 0.01. Finally, the authors in (Voronin, Baumann, and Lessmann 2018) investigated the impact of CT activity on content visibility and popularity on Instagram. They claimed that Instagram is vulnerable to CT activities and stressed the need for a CT detector. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to implement such a detector, using a semi-supervised approach never used on Instagram.

3 Methodology

We now describe the methodology implemented for discovering and analyzing CT engagement (Sec. 3.1 and Sec. 3.2 respectively), alongside ethical considerations (Sec. 3.3).

3.1 Crowdturfing Profile Detection

To detect crowdturfing activities, we first needed to identify profiles involved in them. To this aim, we began our study by purchasing CT active followers to study their profiles' characteristics (Sec. 4), which will be used in our detection algorithm (Sec. 5). Detecting CT profiles is significantly different from spotting bots or fake profiles, as done in previous works. CT profiles are mainly real accounts belonging to individuals willing to create fake interactions, and are thus more difficult to be uncovered. Indeed, their fake interactions should be very similar to genuine ones, which forced us to use the profile information of the content maker rather

than the content itself for the detection. Moreover, we use general profile info (e.g., the number of followers, following, posts) instead of behavioral patterns since Instagram does not offer the possibility to obtain such information, in opposition to other Social Media like Twitter. Last, we use semi-supervised learning, in contrast to supervised techniques of previous works on bots and fake accounts detection, to make great use of unlabeled data, since obtaining labeled data for CT profiles is challenging (Song, Lee, and Kim 2015). To sum up, to detect CT activities, we rely on a semi-supervised classifier that detects whether the accounts involved in a target activity are genuine or not by leveraging on their general profiles’ characteristics. For instance, to detect CT comments or likes on an IG post, we would collect the profile information of all the commenters/likers, feed them into our classifier to detect the CT accounts, and isolate their comments/likes accordingly.

3.2 Crowdturfing Engagement Analysis

After building our classifier, we run it in the wild to detect and analyze CT engagement. On Instagram, the primary forms of engagement are viewing, liking, and commenting. CT-generated and genuine views and likes are impossible to distinguish from the action itself, since the only information they carry is if they happened or not (people cannot perform different types of likes or views). As previously mentioned, Instagram does not provide tools or APIs to track its users’ behavior, making it very difficult to determine CT activities’ targets as done for Twitter (Thomas et al. 2013). Instead, the profile’s information is readily available, and comments carry valuable information such as stylometric features or treated topics, which can be exploited to detect CT comments directly from the action itself, in opposition to likes and views. For these reasons, we focused on studying more in detail the profiles of users we identified as non-genuine in Sec. 6, and the content of their comments in Sec. 7. We focused mainly on comments since they present both a higher level of public expression (Aldous et al. 2019), and are more important than likes or views to boost the visibility of an account (statusbrew 2021; Chacon 2017). These analyses could help improve the classifier or build alternative ones working directly on comments. Clearly, the analyses mentioned above are limited by the accuracy of the starting classifier; thus, thorough experiments are conducted in Section 5 to build a robust detector. Finally, similarly for CT comments detection, our approach leveraging profiles’ features can be applied to classify other forms of engagement, such as views or likes.

3.3 Ethical Considerations

In our work, we faced two main ethical challenges: CT activities’ involvement and data collection on Instagram. Our experiments were designed following the exemption guideline from a formal review by our institute’s IRB.

To deal with CT activities, we acted similarly to previous works that analyze underground activities (Thomas et al. 2013; Song, Lee, and Kim 2015; Voronin, Baumann, and Lessmann 2018), first by dealing only with a small number of CT followers and platforms, minimizing our effect

on them and Instagram. Second, we linked the followers to freshly created accounts that had no prior connection with other IG accounts, and we deleted them at the end of the study. Thus, CT activities did not involve legitimate users.

For data collection, we gathered profiles’ information and comments. We only collected publicly available data, removing all the information possibly linked to individual subjects (e.g., name, profile picture). Similar to previous works (Quercia et al. 2011; Hanson et al. 2013), we could not request informed consent to prevent participants from (in)voluntarily changing their behavior, causing the Hawthorne effect (Franke and Kaul 1978). Since IG APIs do not return all the public information of a user’s profile, yet visible by simply browsing it, we collected such data in an automated way, which is not allowed by the ToS. However, as argued by Fiesler et al. (Fiesler, Beard, and Keegan 2020), “ethical decisions regarding data collection should go beyond ToS and consider contextual factors of the source and research”. In particular, Instagram ToS allows manual collection, suggesting that automated collection is probably not allowed to avoid heavy servers’ workload (Fiesler, Beard, and Keegan 2020). Therefore, we tuned our tools to collect data at a slow human-like pace, using only our 11 profiles over five months, avoiding any ban from the platform.

4 Crowdturfing Providers Analysis

To spot crowdturfing (CT) activities, such as fake followings, likes, or comments, we need to study, understand, and collect “authentic” crowdturfing profiles. Previous studies on fake profiles detection collected fake profiles or bots by manually searching for poorly designed accounts, such as those without a profile pic, with alpha-numeric names, or a very low number of posts and followers (Akyon and Kalfaoglu 2019; Sheikhi 2020). Other works focused on synthetic data (Thejas et al. 2019), or bought mostly naive fake accounts from local providers (Purba, Asirvatham, and Murugesan 2020). However, the profiles gathered using these methodologies indubitably introduce bias in the data, and the resulting detectors will identify just simply profiles, very likely driven by a bot-master.

Instead, we are interested in spotting fake activities conducted by real people profiles, that are populating and remaining on Instagram by evading its bot detection mechanisms (Morales 2021). To this aim, we selected 10 well-known crowdturfing providers and bought from each of them 100 fake followers. All the providers we selected ensure to deliver followers who interact with the target profiles by liking and commenting on their posts to boost their engagement rate. These CT profiles are identified as high-quality followers and usually cost more than “base” fake profiles. The reliability of these providers is supported by famous reviews platforms like TrustPilot¹. The characteristics of these providers are reported in Table 1, along information of a provider delivering low-quality followers. We also included information on real profiles with less than 500 followers we used in our study. We excluded influencers and celebrities in this stage for a fair comparison. To limit CT

¹<https://www.trustpilot.com/>

Table 1: Characteristics of Crowdturfing providers. The table reports information claimed by the provider and retrieved by analyzing 100 profiles bought from each. The last row reports info on real profiles for comparison.

<i>Provider</i>	<i>Price</i>	<i>Delivery Time</i>	<i>Drop Protection</i>	<i>Followers Received</i>	<i>Followers 1 Month</i>	<i>#Followers Avg (std)</i>	<i>#Following Avg (std)</i>	<i>Private Profiles</i>	<i>#Posts Avg (std)</i>	<i>URLs in Biography</i>
CT-1	\$5.69	Instant	yes	115	74	409.59 (1110.46)	812.38 (1331.52)	0.13%	14.83 (57.98)	0.08%
CT-2	\$2.39	5-10m	no	211	340	44.61 (106.85)	4679.75 (1452.19)	0%	16.0 (8.06)	0%
CT-3	\$2.95	Instant	yes	111	85	132.17 (327.28)	3027.08 (1883.18)	0.05%	20.19 (55.99)	0.09%
CT-4	\$2	Instant	no	100	42	239.45 (262.64)	2735.6 (1286.65)	0.45%	111.95 (332.2)	0.01%
CT-5	\$3.95	Gradual	yes	79	61	201.43 (214.0)	3510.77 (2316.12)	0%	16.06 (12.13)	0.054%
CT-6	\$2.89	24-72h	yes	136	129	36.79 (39.64)	2398.88 (2191.18)	0%	14.06 (5.69)	0%
CT-7	\$2.70	1h	yes	108	109	39.23 (73.32)	3966.36 (761.16)	0%	19.74 (20.13)	0%
CT-8	\$5.78	Gradual	no	110	95	57.52 (138.97)	1818.84 (1353.95)	0.04%	29.75 (41.09)	0.01%
CT-9	\$3.95	12h	no	109	99	129.54 (759.85)	2012.93 (1198.17)	0.06%	26.99 (74.94)	0%
CT-10	\$5.94	Gradual	no	97	94	83.38 (174.57)	2118.31 (1323.78)	0.03%	40.28 (51.5)	0%
Low quality	\$0.80	24-72h	no	117	96	87.26 (276.26)	3200.67 (3041.89)	0.04%	1.88 (6.15)	0.02%
Real	-	-	-	-	-	359.33 (237.87)	571.24 (517.53)	57.92%	279.09 (369.67)	14.44%

activities on Instagram, we bought CT followers for profiles we created for the study, which we deleted at the end. We are not reporting the names of the CT providers to avoid the encouragement of such activities.

The table shows that the price average is pretty low, around \$3 for 100 high-quality followers and only \$0.80 for 100 low-quality followers. Most providers deliver the followers within a few hours. They offer a drop protection, which means that the number of followers the customer purchases will either remain stable over time or new followers will be delivered to replenish the lost ones. As a double-check of the providers’ reliability, we checked the number of followers that remained on our profiles after one month. We found that, on average, we lost only 15-20% of our CT followers, and in some cases, we gained more than expected. The most significant follower drop is seen from CT-4, which was the less expensive CT provider. On the contrary, we lost only three followers from the most expensive CT-10. By analyzing the balance of followers and following, there is a noticeable difference between CT profiles and real ones. This is understandable, given that the more they follow and interact, the more they get paid. However, from CT-1, the second most expensive provider, the follower/following balance is quite close to real profiles. The CT profiles also are quite different from real ones in terms of being a private profile, the number of posts, and the presence of URLs in the biography. Very likely, being a public profile is a requirement to join CT platforms. People joining these platforms are interested in generating a minimum amount of posts that make them reliable, except few cases (CT-4, CT-10). The low-quality profiles show a very high imbalance in followers and following, and the average number of posts is close to 0, far below the CT profiles.

Among the properties we did not report in the table, some providers allow their customers to increase their followers periodically or buy followers from a specific geographical region, thus interacting in a particular language. Although we cannot know certainly which CT profiles were bots, fakes, or real accounts driven by real people, we believe we included all these categories from the 11 providers, given their statistics about the drop rate, the follower/following balance, and the number of posts. Moreover, many of our CT providers allow people to freely join their platforms to participate in CT activities, which confirms the reliability of

the platforms and the presence of human activity behind the fake engagement they generate. Thus, our detector would be trained on several heterogeneous fake profiles categories, resulting in being more reliable than those trained on simple bots or synthetic data.

5 Crowdturfing Profiles Detection

In this section, we discuss the dataset we collected to classify CT profiles (Sec. 5.1), the model selection (Sec. 5.2), and the data collection for analysis in the wild (Sec. 5.3).

5.1 Dataset and feature selection

There are no Instagram CT datasets available; therefore, we collected our one. Since Instagram API could not provide our requirements, we performed automated data collection through Selenium². The dataset contains the profile information of 2600 users, including 1293 CT and 1307 authentic accounts. We balanced the authentic accounts based on the number of followers, including, from different countries, ordinary people accounts (from our circle of friends) and well-known influencers from different tiers³. Thus, we tried to have a representative IG real account population sample. The CT profiles are the ones analyzed in Section 4. We are aware that a bigger sample would be more representative of the reality, but working with little data is the core of semi-supervised techniques. To analyze public and private profiles, we focused on the shared attributes retrievable from the source code of the profile’s page, which slightly differ from the rendered ones (e.g., #videos is visible only from the source code). First, we gathered all the available attributes from a user’s profile page. Second, we pre-processed the features by removing those with zero or very low variance. Last, we transformed categorical and non-numeric attributes to have only numeric and boolean features in the final set, as shown in Table 2. We are willing to share our dataset upon request for research purposes only.

5.2 Model selection

We take advantage of semi-supervised learning methods to make the most of the labeled and unlabeled data and

²<https://www.selenium.dev/>

³<https://www.dotcominfoway.com/blog/influencer-marketing-2020/>

Table 2: Final set of features of our dataset.

<i>Numeric Features</i>	<i>Boolean Features</i>
# followers	Account is private
# following	Account is verified
# videos	Account has clips
# posts	Account is business account
# characters in username	Account has external URLs
# characters in fullname	Accounts has category name
# characters in biography	Account has multiple categories
# digits in username	
# non-alphabetic char in fullname	
# hashtags and mentions in biography	

get better generalization performance. These methods reduce the need for manual labeling, which can be costly and time-consuming, still reaching appreciable performance. While most previous semi-supervised approaches on social networks utilized graph-based methods, we consider only profile-related features. This makes our model less complicated and easier to handle. In our experiments, we focused on self-training, using Scikit-learn⁴ for the implementation. In self-training, a supervised classifier works in a semi-supervised fashion by learning from unlabeled data. The classifier iteratively predicts pseudo-labels for the unlabeled data and adds them to the training set. The iterations continue until the maximum number of iterations is reached or no unlabeled data remains. Pseudo-labeled data are added to the training set if their prediction probability is above a threshold or in the 'k_best' probabilities. In the experiments, we set a threshold of 0.75 and the maximum iteration to 10. As base classifiers, we tested K-Nearest Neighbor (KNN), Logistic Regression (LR), Random Forest (RF), and Decision Tree (DT). As hyper-parameters, we tuned in a gridsearch fashion: the number of neighbors [1, 3, 5, 10] for KNN; the penalty [none, 11, l2], C [10, 1, 0.1], and solver [lbfgs, liblinear] for LR; the max depth [none, 3, 5, 10], samples per leaf [1, 3, 5, 10] for DT and RF, plus the number of estimators [10, 100, 1000] for RF. We evaluated the classifiers on different labeled data portions to select the best model. Since we aimed to show the power of semi-supervised learning, we used only small portions of labeled data: 1, 3, 5, and 9 percent. We randomly split our dataset in a stratified mode to have 80 percent of data for training (2080 labeled samples) and the remaining for testing. We used the repeated StratifiedKFold cross-validation with five folds and ten repetitions on the training set to get a more precise model. We also trained the classifiers on all the labeled data (i.e., in a supervised mode) for comparison. The results for the four best different classifiers during the cross-validation are reported in Table 3.

As shown in the table, increasing the amount of labeled data does not necessarily improve the model's performance. Moreover, the results in the semi-supervised mode do not differ significantly from those in a supervised way. This suggests that CT profiles share very similar characteristics, as partially discussed in Sec. 4, and that the algorithm can converge by taking a few labeled data. On the contrary, adding

⁴https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.semi_supervised.SelfTrainingClassifier.html

Table 3: Averages of classification results of the best proposed models.

	<i>Model and % Labels Used</i>	<i>Train Accuracy</i>	<i>Valid. Accuracy</i>	<i>Valid. Precision</i>	<i>Valid. Recall</i>	<i>Valid. F-Measure</i>
KNN	<i>0.01</i>	0.79	0.79	0.84	0.79	0.79
	<i>0.03</i>	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
	<i>0.05</i>	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
	<i>0.07</i>	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
	<i>0.09</i>	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
	<i>1.00</i>	0.97	0.96	0.97	0.96	0.96
LR	<i>0.01</i>	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97
	<i>0.03</i>	0.78	0.77	0.84	0.77	0.76
	<i>0.05</i>	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.94	0.94
	<i>0.07</i>	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
	<i>0.09</i>	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96
	<i>1.00</i>	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96
RF	<i>0.01</i>	0.87	0.87	0.88	0.87	0.87
	<i>0.03</i>	0.92	0.91	0.92	0.91	0.91
	<i>0.05</i>	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90
	<i>0.07</i>	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91
	<i>0.09</i>	0.96	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
	<i>1.00</i>	1.00	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
DT	<i>0.01</i>	0.86	0.85	0.86	0.85	0.85
	<i>0.03</i>	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88
	<i>0.05</i>	0.92	0.91	0.92	0.91	0.91
	<i>0.07</i>	0.92	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91
	<i>0.09</i>	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
	<i>1.00</i>	1.00	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95

more samples could potentially lead to over-fitting and reduce the classification accuracy. The LR classifier with 1 percent of labeled data (penalty = l2, C = 1, solver = liblinear) was selected as the final model based on cross-validation results, since it showed more stable results. The final model reached 95% accuracy and F1-score on the test set and was used in our further analyses. Given that we are the first to build such a detector on IG, there are no baselines to compare our work with. Prior works on bots and fake account detection are not sharing their datasets or models, and a comparison with them would not be fair since they do not deal with CT accounts. We remind the reader that our main contribution is to introduce such a novel CT detector.

5.3 Spotting crowdturfing in the wild

Liking and commenting are two types of main engagement on Instagram posts. Users express their ideas through comments, such as supporting or degrading a person, propagating spam, advertising, etc. In addition, commenting has a more critical role in increasing the visibility of an influencer (statusbrew 2021; Chacon 2017). Therefore, analyzing this type of engagement can give us a better insight into the nature of CT engagement on the content posted by celebrities and influencers. For this purpose, we collected the comments and commenters' profile information of 50 recent posts of 20 mega-influencers with over 1 million followers (1000 posts in total). The influencers were of different nationalities and were selected from the most popular categories on Instagram, including fashion, beauty, fitness, art, music, lifestyle, and family. In total, we gathered 603.007 comments generated by 248.388 unique users. We exploited the popular Instaloader⁵ library to collect commenters features. Next, we run our CT classifier on the commenters to find CT profiles and fake comments accordingly. The next two sections report the results of such analysis.

⁵<https://instaloader.github.io/>

6 Crowdturfing Profiles Analysis

The model presented in Section 5 detected 55,719 CT profiles among the 248,388 collected (~22%). This percentage is in accordance with a recent analysis conducted on celebrities and Virtual Influencers (Conti, Gathani, and Tricomi 2022), based on reports provided by HypeAuditors⁶, a website specialized in influencers analysis. The analysis and HypeAuditor reports show for mega influencers and celebrities about 20 to 40% of fake audience, on average. Furthermore, to verify the reliability of our detector, we manually inspected and classified 1000 random profiles analyzed by our algorithm (both genuine and CT), without knowing its prediction. We found algorithm’s classification in accordance with our guesses in 89.4% of the cases. These results confirm the good reliability of our detector. Since CT profiles contribute to a fake engagement, we will also refer to them as fake (non-genuine) accounts. Given the high number of profiles we collected, we could not analyze all of them manually. Thus, we decided to conduct more analysis on the CT and real profiles spotted by our model to understand the main differences between those accounts. In this section, we will first show a comparison between the number of followers and followings of fake and normal users (Sec. 6.1). Then, in Sec. 6.2 and Sec 6.3 we focus on CT profiles’ biography and external URL, respectively, to determine whether they are involved in malicious activities besides crowdturfing.

6.1 Followers and followings of fake and normal users

In this study, we want to understand the differences between fake and normal users in terms of the number of followers and followings. As explained in section 4, we expect that a fake account, to increase other accounts’ engagement (and consequently gain more money), will show an oddly-high number of followings. On the contrary, normal users should have a more balanced ratio of followers and followings or lean toward having more followers, according to Instagram averages (Erin 2020). In Figure 1, we show the mean and std of the number of followers and following for fake and real users. For better visualization, the real users are divided into normal accounts and influencers tiers as follows:

- *Normal accounts*: less than 1.000 followers;
- *Nano influencers*: $1.000 \leq \text{followers} < 10.000$;
- *Micro influencers*: $10.000 \leq \text{followers} < 50.000$;
- *Mid-tier influencers*: $50.000 \leq \text{followers} < 500.000$;
- *Macro influencers*: $500.000 \leq \text{followers} < 1.000.000$;
- *Mega influencers*: more than 1.000.000 followers.

Note that in Figure 1, in the y-axis, we used a logarithmic scale to visualize the results better. The first important information inferred from the graph is that the number of followers of the fake users is (on average) much smaller than the number of followings. This confirms our initial assumption that being involved in CT activities generates a clear unbalance between followers and followings, since people are

⁶For instance, the Cristiano Ronaldo report is available here: <https://app.hypeauditor.com/instagram/cristiano/>




Figure 1: Followers and following average and standard deviation of CT users (Fake) and different categories of real users (Normal, Nano, Micro, Mid-Tier, Macro, Mega).

incentivized to follow more people to increase their earnings. Moreover, as expected, the normal users have a balanced number of followers and followings, but as the popularity of the genuine account grows, the number of followers increases exponentially, while the followings are placed around the 1.000 mark. The graph shows that the standard deviation grows as the influencers become more popular. This happens because the different categories include influencers from wide ranges, especially in mid-tier, macro, and mega. For example, there are accounts with both one or hundreds of million followers in the mega influencers category. Since we are more interested in CT accounts, we studied the distribution of the number of followings for those accounts. The results are shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Distribution of fake accounts’ followings.

In the x-axis, the number of followings are grouped in bins of size 500, while the y-axis represents the number of CT profiles in each bin. It is glaring that most of the CT accounts have between 0 and 500 followings, and their number decreases as the number of followings increases, except for the last two bins. To limit spamming activities, Instagram limits the number of followings to 7,500, showing an error message when this limited is exceeded⁷. Fake accounts in the [7,000 - 7,500] bin are probably aware of this limitation; thus, they exploit this guideline to maximize engagement activities. Despite the limit of the following imposed by Insta-

⁷<https://help.instagram.com/408167069251249>

gram, there are still 304 fake profiles in the range [7.500 - 8.000]. Very likely, these profiles surpassed the 7.500 threshold before the introduction of the automated following limitation.

6.2 Fake profiles biography analysis

In this section, we focused on the biography of CT users. It is well known that many fake Instagram accounts use a catchy biography to lure their victims into clicking some malicious links. Thus, we tried to find suspicious words inside the CT users' biography in this part of the profiles' analysis. To this aim, we created a list of 31 elements, including both words and emojis, often used by this kind of fake user. The list, based on our knowledge of fake behaviour and a brief manual inspection, contained words like "stories", "chat", "follow", "gain", "click", "link", and emojis (reported according to the CLDR short name of Unicode standard⁸) like "no one under eighteen", "sweat droplets", "down arrow", or "kiss mark". This analysis shows that 5.635 CT accounts have at least one of the elements of the list, corresponding to 10,11% of the total number of fake users we detected. Thus, most CT accounts are not trying to induce people to click links or increase their engagement (by increasing their profile numbers). Instead, this confirms that most of the accounts involved in CT activities, rather than scamming people, are interested in making profits by increasing the engagement of other accounts. This result is fairly in accordance with prior works on Twitter (Song, Lee, and Kim 2015) and Sina Weibo (Wang et al. 2012), in which CT activities were mainly related to manipulation of accounts' popularity or political campaigns.

6.3 Fake profiles external URLs analysis

The last analysis performed on the CT accounts is based on their external URL. This analysis aims to understand which are the most used URLs among CT users and to understand if they could be vectors of attacks conducted over social networks (Luo et al. 2009). Out of the total fake accounts, only 2.834 (5,08%) have an external URL on their profile page. These 2.834 URLs have been grouped into the following ten categories:

- *Videogame*: Youtube, Twitch, Discord;
- *Messaging*: Whatsapp, Telegram;
- *Social Network*: Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Linkedin, TikTok, Pinterest, Tumblr, F3.cool, Tellonym.me;
- *Music & Fotography*: Spotify, Soundcloud, Vsco.co;
- *Email & Google services*: Google, Gmail, Google maps, Hotmail, Yahoo, Outlook;
- *URL redirecting*: Linktr.ee, Tinyurl, Linkr.bio, Bit.ly, Bio.site;
- *Shopping & Payment*: PayPal, Vinted, Amazon, Patreon, Pomagam.pl, Gofund.me, Boxfreshapp;
- *Personal website & Petition*: Blogspot, Wordpress, Wattpad, Blacklivesmatter, Change.org;

⁸<https://unicode.org/emoji/charts/emoji-list.html>

- *Adult content*: URLs to different adult websites;
- *Other*.

Note that inside the different categories, we also included some shortened URLs (e.g., the shortened URL of Whatsapp that is wa.me, or the shortened URL of Telegram is t.me), that are omitted to make the domains inside each category as clear as possible. The results are shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: External URLs of the fake profiles, grouped by category.

Remark that even if the categories contain well-known websites, some of them can be used for malicious purposes. To prove this point, we investigated the Whatsapp links in the "messaging" category, and we found that some of them start a conversation or a phone call with a stranger that can easily be a potential scammer. Another example are the Telegram URLs, which we grouped in the following main classes after monitoring their activities:

- *Conversation*: Similarly to Whatsapp URLs, starts a conversation with a potential scammer;
- *Piracy*: Illegal groups that share movies and tv series;
- *Selling*: Scam groups that try to sell clothes, Amazon gift cards, cryptocurrencies, NFTs, etc.

Moreover, the Linktree URLs inside the "URL redirecting" category are commonly used by fake profiles to redirect the victim to a malicious website (Lakshmi 2020). From Figure 3 it's possible to see that the "Other" section is more relevant than the other categories inside the pie chart, with precisely 961 URLs. It contains very heterogeneous URLs, making their categorization challenging. To better understand these URLs' nature (i.e., know if the URL is malicious or not), we have relied on a fraud prevention and detection service called Ipqualityscore⁹. It allows to check for suspicious links by using a mixture of blacklists and deep learning algorithms, and it also allows to define the typology of an URL. The system allows to identify the following URLs categories:

- *Parked*: They can be newly registered websites or very old domains that have been sitting dormant. This category also includes aliases and suspicious redirect URLs;
- *Spamming*: Websites that aim to spam malicious content to the victim;

⁹<https://www.ipqualityscore.com/>

- **Malware:** Websites currently hosting exploit kits, viruses, and malware which can compromise a user’s computer or device;
- **Phishing:** Websites that host a fake login, registration, or sign up form meant to capture the user’s sensitive data;
- **Adult:** Websites that contain adult content.

The results of this study are shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Results provided by the fraud prevention and detection service on the URLs in the “Other” category.

For convenience, we grouped the “Phishing”, “Malware”, and “Adult” categories since they had very few matches. From the total 961 URLs inside the “Other” categories, 599 were considered safe, while the remaining 362 were divided as follows:

- 190 URLs were parked and/or spamming websites;
- 5 URLs were marked as malware websites;
- 7 URLs were marked as phishing websites;
- 11 URLs were adult websites;
- 149 were considered as suspicious websites.

From these results, we can say that most of the external URLs in the “Other” category were considered safe. However, there was a considerable amount of spamming and suspicious websites that can be used for malicious purposes. Comparing the obtained results to the overall number of CT users, we can confirm that most of them are solely involved in CT activities, rather than in other malicious activities.

7 Comments Analysis

To analyze our CT engagement detector in the wild, we gathered from 1000 posts 603.007 comments made by 248.388 unique users. In this section, we present five studies we conducted to spot the differences between comments made by CT and real users. The analyses we discuss in this section are the following:

1. **Stylometric Analysis** (Sec. 7.1): an in-depth breakdown of the comments to evaluate the style thorough statistical analysis to understand the differences between fake and normal users’ writing fashions;
2. **Common Words Analysis** (Sec. 7.2): an examination of the most used words by both user categories;
3. **Number of Comments Per User** (Sec. 7.3): a brief quantitative analysis regarding the numbers of comments posted by users;

4. **Language Analysis** (Sec. 7.4): an analysis to understand the variety of language used by both real and CT profiles;
5. **Topics Analysis** (Sec. 7.5): a study to understand the most common topics for the English comments shared by CT users.

A limitation of our analysis is that, given the real nature of CT accounts, not necessarily all of their activities are fake. However, since discerning authentic and unauthentic activities a priori is almost impossible in most cases, we considered all CT accounts activities as unauthentic, and analyzed them a posteriori to possibly grasp the differences.

7.1 Stylometric Analysis

From a dataset of over 600.000 comments, we isolated 121.822 shared by CT users and 481.185 from legit ones. We performed a stylometric analysis similar to the one conducted in (Bhargava, Mehndiratta, and Asawa 2013), based on Lexical Features, Syntactical Features, and Emoji Features.

Lexical Features In this category, we included the number of sentences per comment, the number of words in each comment, the number of words in each sentence, and the length of the comments. We found a distinction between the two classes of users previously defined: the CT users have an overall mean of 1.13 words per comment, while the real ones have 4.34. Similarly, the number of words per sentence is 0.94 for the CT accounts and 2.96 for the real ones. Both categories of users have a mean of 1.35 sentences per comment. In each comment, there is a low repetition of words: we obtained that 99% of them, made by CT users, have no words repetitions, while for the legit users is 97%. Another important distinction is the length of the comments: the CT users shared text with a mean length of 28.89 (std: 61.19) characters (emojis included), while the legit users have a mean of 23.74 (std: 46.74). Section 7.1 better explains how the real users, with more words, have shorter comments.

Syntactical Features These features include characteristics such as the number of comments starting with a capital letter, punctuation presents in the text, and capital words. We found very close results between CT and real users: the beginning of the comment is in uppercase for 33.86% of comments made by fake users and for 34.94% of real ones. 35% of the comments have some punctuation for both accounts categories. Finally, we saw that both categories do not use upper-cased words: the mean of the ratios between upper-case words and all the words in each comment are 0.021 for the fake users and 0.025 for the legit ones.

Emoji Features Thanks to `demoji`¹⁰ python module, we were able to detect the emojis correctly in the comments. Indeed, it is not a trivial task since new emojis are constantly added in the standard¹¹. Our study focused in particular on:

1. **The percentage of comments with at least one emoji;**

¹⁰<https://pypi.org/project/demoji/>

¹¹<https://blog.emojipedia.org/first-look-new-emojis-in-ios-15-4/>

2. **Most used emojis:** the percentage of an emoji among all the fake comments. Multiple occurrences of the same emoji on the same comment increase the counter by one.
3. **Avg emojis used when present:** considering only comments that present an emoji, the avg number of emojis in it. Multiple occurrences of the same emoji increase the counter accordingly.

Table 4: Emoji-based Stylometric analysis.

	Fake Users	Real Users
1)	0.716	0.727
2)	Red Heart: 25.18%	Red Heart: 22.30%
	Heart Eyes: 19.92%	Heart Eyes: 18.46%
	Fire: 10.57%	Fire: 14.42%
	Clapping Hand: 4.91%	Clapping Hands: 5.00%
	Laughing Tears: 4.03%	Laughing Tears: 4.92%
	Raising Hands: 2.73%	Raising Hands: 3.04%
	Others each under 2%	Others each under 2%
3)	avg: 3.557	avg: 3.211

The results of these analyses are reported in Table 4. The top-most emojis used are the same for both users, with a similar percentage. Another meaningful result is that even if real users have, on average, slightly more comments with emojis. This result might explain the outcomes on comment length found in Section 7.1. To sum up, the results obtained so far show, as expected, little difference between CT and real users when the focus is on emoji used, sentences per comments, or syntactical features in general. But legit users share comments with more words and fewer emojis with an overall shorter comment length.

7.2 Common Words Analysis

This analysis aims to understand the most common words CT and real profiles use. As a pre-processing, we must filter the comments by removing emojis, punctuations, and unproductive words with less than three characters like: “and”, “the”, “les”, “you”, etc. The word clouds in Figure 5 show the top 100 most used words by fake and real users. In general, we found a lot of positive and love expressions, such as beautiful, love, happiness, niceness, etc.



Figure 5: Word clouds of most used words.

One word that stands out from Figure 5a is “Dokter”, which appeared in 1069 distinct comments. By further investigating the accounts spamming such word, we found a small portion of what seems to be a botnet whose objective is to spam “Instagram doctors” accounts. All these doctors’ profiles have a WhatsApp business link that, once

clicked, starts a chat with a message to complete. The doctor’s conversation begins with a specific text: “*NAMA*: *KOTA/TINGGAL*: *ORDER/KELUHAN*: *UMUR*:”, which in Indonesian means: “*NAME*: *CITY/STATE*: *ORDER/COMPLAINTS*: *AGE*:” (the asterisks are used for the bold WhatsApp markdown). One of the doctors’ accounts no longer exists on Instagram, suggesting that probably the profile was disabled by Instagram due to a ToS violation. Other similar accounts gained our attention in the following format: “dr. [doctor_name]”. The account presented the same WhatsApp link and conversation, just with a different phone number. We found 1370 comments coming from 33 different accounts containing such words, suggesting the presence of a bigger botnet.

7.3 Number of Comments per User

248.388 unique users posted the 603.007 comments we analyzed; thus, many users posted multiple comments. In our dataset, a legit user, on average, has posted 1.95 comments (std 5.94), while a CT user has posted slightly more (2.24, std 7.57). The result obtained in this analysis complies with the one in Section 7.1: an identified fake user has a similar behavior as the legit user. However, a CT user generally shares more comments than a real one because their purpose is to generate engagement. But to avoid Instagram bot detection, an account has to act like a real human being.

7.4 Language Analysis

This study aims to understand the language used by the fake users compared to the one used by the legit users. To detect the language of the comments, we employed Python’s SpaCy module¹². SpaCy is an open-source library for advanced Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks. The version we implemented introduces transformer-based pipelines that bring SpaCy’s accuracy to the current state-of-the-art. The text used was filtered out of emojis and then used as input for the neural network. In both CT and real comments, we found that the prominent language is English (35.2% and 43.5%, respectively), followed by Japanese and French. The results are shown in the pie charts in Figure 6. The “Other” slices include more than 100 languages, each with a presence below 2%. They are probably the second largest sections of the pie charts because many comments were just mentions to other accounts or single words, complicating the language detection process. Besides that, it seems that the fake users adopt the language of the community they target or, more commonly, English. In fact, as stated in Section 4, many CT providers allow the option to deliver followers from specific graphical locations.

7.5 Topics Analysis

To further investigate the behavior of the CT users, it is interesting to grasp the topics they deal with in the comments. Many state-of-the-art topic modeling algorithms, such as Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA), require long text to extract its topics. However, social networks comments are usually concise sentences, making the topic modeling more

¹²SpaCy’s website: <https://spacy.io/usage/facts-figures>




Figure 6: Languages detected in comments.

challenging. In our experiments, we used GPU-PDMM(Li et al. 2017), which is typically adopted to extract topics of tweets. Based on the Poisson-based Dirichlet Multinomial Mixture (PDMM) model, GPU-PDMM promotes the semantically related words under the same topic during the sampling process by using the Generalized Polya Urn (GPU) model. We considered only English comments for the analysis, after removing emojis and words shorter than three characters. From the 121.822 comments made by CT users, 12.830 comments were suitable for the study. We instructed the model to distinguish ten topics in an unsupervised fashion, returning for each comment the belonging topic and the top words associated with each topic. The results of the topics inference are shown in Table 5. Even in this case, we see that the main topics are related to engagement boosting, using compliments, love words, or, more in general, positive feelings. A striking result is the engagements generated around male and female influencers. Although we considered 12 males and 8 females, most comments (6293) deal with topics related to females rather than males (1211).

Table 5: Top-10 topics extracted from fake comments.

Comments	Top words for topic	Label
2526	beautiful queen cute pretty sexy girl hot gorgeous baby cool sweet angel	Female Sexy
2490	wow gorgeous beauty stunning amazing super perfect awesome goddess angel top nice beautiful very good looking picture pic love lovely sweet smile photo	Female Goddess Photo
1744	you love look beautiful like much god all baby with too always sir both pretty	Both genders Compliments
1090	happy new year birthday diwali halloween thanksgiving christmas republic belated	Holidays
699	best one eyes most world woman ever amazing look her what dear your see life more enjoy liked	Female Beautiful Life
613	hope every moment smiles like big sir fan i'm bro	Male Fitness
607	looks yes have work real you and get well man can great soon wish day video better keep	Male Recovery
604	kiss please red with lips pretty face eyes bite follow lip-lock	Female Face

8 Conclusion

In this work, we developed an algorithm that leverages profiles' characteristics through semi-supervised learning to spot accounts involved in Instagram crowdturfing activities. To train our classifier, we purchased CT profiles from 11 providers, which we further studied to understand their services and the type of profiles involved in them. Our classifier, based on Logistic regression, scored 0.95% F1-score.

To spot Instagram CT activities in the wild, we targeted the most recent posts of 20 influencers of different nationalities and categories. We mainly focused on comments, as they are a crucial engagement metrics for accounts' visibility, and carry more information than views and likes. For this purpose, we collected 603.007 comments among the different posts made by 248.388 unique users. Our model labeled 55.719 of these profiles as CT accounts. We compared CT profiles and comments with genuine ones, concluding that CT activities would be difficult to detect based only on their activities. Indeed, CT profiles are mostly real profiles guided by real humans; thus, their activities are close to genuine ones. In contrast to bots or fake profiles, they do not seem to be involved with other malicious activities besides boosting other accounts' engagement.

In the future, we plan to discover CT activities by leveraging on accounts' behavior rather than their characteristics. This would increase the detection scalability and possibly allow us to predict future CT activities. Finally, while Instagram and the research community focused a lot on detecting bots and automated accounts, we believe more studies should be conducted on CT activities, which negatively impact influencer marketing, the Instagram platform, and most of its users.

References

- Akyon, F. C.; and Kalfaoglu, M. E. 2019. Instagram fake and automated account detection. In *2019 Innovations in Intelligent Systems and Applications Conference (ASYU)*.
- Al-Qurishi, M.; et al. 2018. SybilTrap: A graph-based semi-supervised Sybil defense scheme for online social networks. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience* 30(5): e4276.
- Aldous, K. K.; et al. 2019. View, like, comment, post: Analyzing user engagement by topic at 4 levels across 5 social media platforms for 53 news organizations. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 13, 47–57.
- Alharthi, R.; Alhothali, A.; and Moria, K. 2019. Detecting and characterizing arab spammers campaigns in Twitter. *Procedia Computer Science* 163: 248–256.
- Alvari, H.; Shaabani, E.; and Shakarian, P. 2021. Semi-Supervised Causal Inference for Identifying Pathogenic Social Media Accounts. In *Identification of Pathogenic Social Media Accounts*, 51–61. Springer.
- Bhargava, M.; Mehndiratta, P.; and Asawa, K. 2013. Stylo-metric analysis for authorship attribution on twitter. In *International Conference on Big Data Analytics*, 37–47.
- Chacon, B. 2017. 5 Things to Know About the Instagram Algorithm. Available at <https://later.com/blog/instagram-algorithm/>. Accessed on: 07-16-2017.
- Conti, M.; Gathani, J.; and Tricomi, P. P. 2022. Virtual Influencers in Online Social Media. *IEEE Communications Magazine*.
- Dorri, A.; Abadi, M.; and Dadfarnia, M. 2018. Social-botnet: Botnet detection in twitter-like social networking

- services using semi-supervised collective classification. In *2018 DASC/PiCom/DataCom/CyberSciTech*, 496–503.
- Erin. 2020. Instagram Followers: How Many Does the Average Person Have? Available at <https://www.hashtagsforlikes.co/blog/instagram-followers-how-many-does-the-average-person-have/>. Accessed on: 03-20-2022.
- Fiesler, C.; Beard, N.; and Keegan, B. C. 2020. No robots, spiders, or scrapers: Legal and ethical regulation of data collection methods in social media terms of service. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, volume 14, 187–196.
- Franke, R. H.; and Kaul, J. D. 1978. The Hawthorne experiments: First statistical interpretation. *American sociological review* 623–643.
- Gong, N. Z.; et al. 2014. Sybilbelief: A semi-supervised learning approach for structure-based sybil detection. *IEEE TIFS* 9(6): 976–987.
- Hanson, C. L.; et al. 2013. Tweaking and tweeting: exploring Twitter for nonmedical use of a psychostimulant drug (Adderall) among college students. *Journal of medical Internet research* 15(4): e2503.
- Kim, S.; and Han, J. 2020. Detecting engagement bots on social influencer marketing. In *International Conference on Social Informatics*, 124–136. Springer.
- Lakshmi, K. 2020. Bot Comments On Instagram Are Becoming Horrendous. Available at <https://www.eatmy.news/2020/11/bot-comments-on-instagram-are-becoming.html>. Accessed on: 03-27-2022.
- Lee, K.; Webb, S.; and Ge, H. 2014. The dark side of micro-task marketplaces: Characterizing fiverr and automatically detecting crowdturfing. In *Eighth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*.
- Li, C.; Duan, Y.; Wang, H.; Zhang, Z.; Sun, A.; and Ma, Z. 2017. Enhancing topic modeling for short texts with auxiliary word embeddings. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* 36(2): 1–30.
- Liao, X.; et al. 2021. Should We Trust Influencers on Social Networks? On Instagram Sponsored Post Analysis. In *2021 International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks (ICCCN)*, 1–8. IEEE.
- Luo, W.; Liu, J.; Liu, J.; and Fan, C. 2009. An Analysis of Security in Social Networks. In *2009 Eighth IEEE International Conference on Dependable, Autonomic and Secure Computing*, 648–651. doi:10.1109/DASC.2009.100.
- Martin, N.; Lessmann, S.; Voß, S.; et al. 2008. Crowdsourcing: Systematisierung praktischer Ausprägungen und verwandter Konzepte. In *Multikonferenz Wirtschaftsinformatik*, 1251–1263.
- Morales, E. 2021. Instagram Bots in 2022 — The Best Bots And Everything Else You Need To Know. Available at <https://bettermarketing.pub/instagram-bots-in-2021-everything-you-need-to-know-b57fb0a3b8e9>. Accessed on 03-28-2022.
- Orabi, M.; et al. 2020. Detection of bots in social media: A systematic review. *Information Processing & Management* 57(4): 102250.
- Purba, K. R.; Asirvatham, D.; and Murugesan, R. K. 2020. Classification of instagram fake users using supervised machine learning algorithms. *International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering* 10(3): 2763.
- Quercia, D.; et al. 2011. In the mood for being influential on twitter. In *2011 IEEE third international conference on privacy, security, risk and trust and 2011 IEEE third international conference on social computing*, 307–314. IEEE.
- Ren, H.; et al. 2018. Online Social Spammer Detection Based on Semi-supervised Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Algorithms, Computing and Artificial Intelligence*, 1–5.
- Sheikhi, S. 2020. An Efficient Method for Detection of Fake Accounts on the Instagram Platform. *Rev. d'Intelligence Artif.* 34(4): 429–436.
- Shi, N.; et al. 2017. Semi-supervised Random Forest for Intrusion Detection Network. In *MAICS*, 181–185.
- Shi, P.; et al. 2019. Detecting malicious social bots based on clickstream sequences. *IEEE Access* 7: 28855–28862.
- Song, J.; Lee, S.; and Kim, J. 2015. Crowdtarget: Target-based detection of crowdturfing in online social networks. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, 793–804.
- Statista. 2021. Instagram - Statistics & Facts. Available at <https://www.statista.com/topics/1882/instagram/#dossierKeyfigures>. Accessed on: 02-08-2022.
- statusbrew. 2021. Instagram Algorithm 2022: How To Conquer It. Available at <https://statusbrew.com/insights/instagram-algorithm/>. Accessed on: 09-07-2021.
- Thejas, G.; et al. 2019. Learning-based model to fight against fake like clicks on instagram posts. In *2019 South-eastCon*, 1–8. IEEE.
- Thomas, K.; McCoy, D.; Grier, C.; Kolcz, A.; and Paxson, V. 2013. {Trafficking} Fraudulent Accounts: The Role of the Underground Market in Twitter Spam and Abuse. In *22nd USENIX Security Symposium*, 195–210.
- Voronin, G.; Baumann, A.; and Lessmann, S. 2018. Crowdturfing on Instagram-The Influence of Profile Characteristics on The Engagement of Others. In *Twenty-Sixth European Conference on Information Systems 2016*.
- Wang, G.; Wilson, C.; Zhao, X.; Zhu, Y.; Mohanlal, M.; Zheng, H.; and Zhao, B. Y. 2012. Serf and turf: crowdturfing for fun and profit. In *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on World Wide Web*, 679–688.
- Yang, X.; Yang, Q.; and Wilson, C. 2015. Penny for your thoughts: Searching for the 50 cent party on sina weibo. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 9, 694–697.
- Zarei, K.; et al. 2020. How impersonators exploit Instagram to generate fake engagement? In *ICC 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, 1–6.