

# The Prevalence of Cybersecurity Misinformation on Social Media: Case Studies on Phishing Reports and Zoom's Threats

Mohit Singhal, Nihal Kumarswamy, Shreyasi Kinhekar, Shirin Nilizadeh

The University of Texas at Arlington

Arlington, Texas, USA

(mohit.singhal,nihal.kumarswamy,shreyasi.kinhekar)@mavs.uta.edu,shirin.nilizadeh@uta.edu

## ABSTRACT

Recently, threat intelligence and security tools have been augmented to use the timely and relevant security information extracted from social media. However, both ordinary users and malicious actors may spread misinformation, which can misguide not only the end-users but also the threat intelligence tools. In this work, for the first time, we study the prevalence of cybersecurity and privacy misinformation on social media, focusing on two different topics: *phishing websites* and *Zoom's security & privacy*. We collected Twitter posts that were warning users about phishing websites and tried to verify these claims. We found about 22% of these tweets to be not valid claims. We then investigated posts about Zoom's security and privacy on multiple platforms, including Instagram, Reddit, Twitter, and Facebook. To detect misinformation related to Zoom, we first created a groundtruth dataset and a taxonomy of misinformation and identified the textual and contextual features to be used for training classifiers to detect posts that discuss the security and privacy of Zoom and detect misinformation. Our classifiers showed great performance, e.g., Reddit and Facebook misinformation classifier reached an accuracy of 99% while Twitter and Instagram reached an accuracy of 98%. Employing these classifiers on the posts from Instagram, Facebook, Reddit, and Twitter, we found that respectively about 3%, 10%, 4% and 0.4% of Zoom's security and privacy posts as misinformation. This highlights the need for social media platforms to dedicate resources to curb the spread of misinformation, and for data-driven security tools to propose methods to minimize the impact of such misinformation on their performance.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Security and privacy**; • **Information systems** → **Social networking sites**; *World Wide Web*; • **Social and professional topics** → **Phishing**;

## KEYWORDS

Phishing, Misinformation, Zoom, Security & Privacy, Classification

## ACM Reference Format:

Mohit Singhal, Nihal Kumarswamy, Shreyasi Kinhekar, Shirin Nilizadeh . 2022. The Prevalence of Cybersecurity Misinformation on Social Media: Case Studies on Phishing Reports and Zoom's Threats. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference'17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Recently, cybersecurity experts use social media to publish the threat information in real-time. For example, recent research has shown that 25% of vulnerabilities appear on social media before the National Vulnerability Database (NVD) [6]. As a result, social media is seen as a source for extracting timely and relevant security information, and numerous threat intelligence tools, such as Spider-Foot [21] and IntelMQ [19], collect open source intelligence from them. Scholars [25, 60, 63, 64, 77, 84, 87] have also proposed methods for identifying new vulnerabilities from social media and updating security databases.

Additionally, social media is used by non-cybersecurity experts to express their concerns over the security and privacy of new technologies. For example, with the surge in the use of video conferencing tools, such as Zoom [7] during the pandemic, came the concerns about the company handling of security and privacy of its user base. Users discuss issues, such as Zoombombing [14], and private Zoom meetings that can be available to the public [8]. Such discussions can affect how users use these technologies, and how companies address these concerns [50].

Prior work has extensively studied misinformation related to political news [59, 74, 83, 86, 104] and public health [31, 51, 54, 62, 68]. While the spread of political and health related posts might have roots in people's political and cultural views and beliefs, in this paper, we investigate if misinformation on technological topics, such as emerging security and privacy threats, are prevalent. Misinformation in general, can misguide end users, but misinformation about cybersecurity and privacy can also mislead data-driven security tools, such as anti-phishing and malware detection tools.

In this work, for the first time, we examine the correctness of Twitter posts about newly detected phishing websites. We define a claim about phishing website misinformation if the phishing link provided in the tweet refers to a benign website, and therefore the report is *false*. We chose to examine inaccurate reports about phishing websites, because: first, phishing is one of the most common threats on the web [4, 20], second, many of the anti-phishing tools rely on reports provided by Internet users [1, 5, 15, 17]. False reports about websites can have various consequences, but the most immediate effect is the decrease in the websites' visits, especially if these websites are added to blocklists used by anti-phishing websites. For investigating the correctness of such phishing reports on social

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).  
*Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA*

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.  
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM... \$15.00  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

media, we employ a multi-step approach, which includes obtaining tweets about phishing, extracting unique URLs, and then regularly checking them via VirusTotal [11], on PhishTank [5] and manually.

As a second case study, we examine the correctness of Instagram, Reddit, Facebook & Twitter posts about Zoom's security and privacy threats. During the global outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, society has found ways to connect via online video calling apps, such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, Skype, etc. During this time, we



Figure 1: Claim about Zoom

also observed a great number of discussions on the security and privacy threats of these technological tools. Not all the discussions were accurate. We define a post about Zoom's security and privacy threats as misinformation if it fails the criteria of providing any supporting evidence from trusted sources, or if it provides information that is fully or partially in contrast with that of trusted sources. For example, Figure 1 shows a claim that Zoom is a "Chinese spying tool." However, the author has not provided any supporting evidence, also, the tweet claims that Zoom does not use any encryption service, which is not true on the date this tweet was posted (see this article [12]). For investigating the correctness of such claims, we employed a multi-step approach, by first obtaining posts from Facebook, Instagram, Reddit, and Twitter, second, creating a ground truth dataset, third, identifying the features that make misinformation posts distinguishable from accurate posts, and finally using the features to build a classifier that detects misinformation. To identify features, we first created a taxonomy of misinformation in our groundtruth dataset using the open coding technique [41], analyzed the meta-data obtained from the posts and authors, and examined the textual and linguistic features.

With these two case studies, our goal is to understand if this is a real problem that needs to be considered and mitigated by data-driven security tools that try to enhance their systems using data obtained from social media, and by social media platforms to minimize the spread of misinformation.

Thus, in this paper, we have the following contributions:

- (1) For the first time, we studied the problem of misinformation about phishing claims on social media and showed that they are prevalent on Twitter.
- (2) We presented a new annotated groundtruth dataset for security & privacy issues regarding Zoom, and a Zoom misinformation taxonomy based on the open source coding.
- (3) We developed classifiers that detect misinformation about Zoom's security and privacy on four different social media platforms and they all showed very good performances.

- (4) Through our analysis, we found that misinformation about Zoom's security and privacy is prevalent on Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and Reddit.

## 2 RELATED WORK

**Obtaining new cybersecurity threats from social media.** Recently, some works have proposed using social media, such as Twitter and Facebook, as the main source of identifying new vulnerabilities. Alves et al. [25] introduced a Twitter streaming threat monitor that generates a continuously updated summary of the threat landscape related to a monitored infrastructure. Okutan et al. [77] integrated tweets with posts from the GDELT news service and Hackmageddon to detect new threats related to one of three topics: Defacement, Denial of Service, and Malicious Email/URL. Sabottke et al. [87] performed a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the vulnerability-related information disseminated on Twitter. Sapienza et al. [89] introduced a system that leverages the communication of malicious actors on the darkweb, as well as activity of cyber security experts on Twitter to automatically generate warnings of imminent or current cyber-threats.

**Misinformation Detection in Social Media.** A large body of work has tried detecting fake political news [40, 96, 97, 111], investigating various linguistic features [44, 52, 69] as well as deep neural networks [37, 58, 59, 105]. In recent months, scholars have analyzed misinformation related to COVID-19 [53, 62, 67, 91, 98]. Brennen et al. [31] identified some of the main types, sources, and claims of COVID-19 misinformation. The authors found that the majority of misinformation on social media came from ordinary people. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first longitudinal & data driven study to find misinformation about security claims made on Twitter about a website being "phishing" and claims made on social media that "Zoom" is a security and privacy threat.

**Phishing websites.** Researchers have extensively addressed phishing attacks by: (1) studying several techniques used by the attackers [24, 28, 32, 34, 42, 46, 47, 66, 100], (2) determining how phishing detection measures fare against these attacks [26, 35, 45, 61, 76, 81, 85, 88, 94, 103, 106, 110], and, 3) investigating a myriad of obfuscation strategies used by the attackers to prevent detection by these prevention tools. For detecting phishing websites, researchers have proposed mechanisms that rely on URL blocklists [23, 27, 70, 75, 95, 99, 101], and machine learning [48, 80, 82, 88, 108].

## 3 ANALYSIS OF PHISHING REPORTS

In this section, we focus on security warnings related to phishing websites and study the presence and prevalence of misinformation and disinformation about these websites on Twitter. We conduct our study on Twitter because of its popularity and accessibility, and its extensive use by security experts [60, 84, 87]. To detect misinformation, we identified *benign* websites that are falsely reported as *phishing* by Twitter users. Collecting such tweets then we tried to validate these claims. Figure 2 shows our framework, that we developed for detecting *phishing* misinformation, with the following modules: (1) Collection of tweets, (2) Pre-processing and filtering, (3) URL extraction, and (4) Checking the URLs via VirusToal and obtaining their labels, i.e., *malicious* or *benign*.




Figure 2: The framework developed for detecting phishing misinformation on Twitter

**(1) Collection of tweets:** First module using the Twitter streaming API [9] collected 1% sample of daily tweets on Twitter that include the keyword *phishing*, from January 11, 2021, to April 11, 2021. **(2) Pre-processing and filtering:** Second module filtered tweets to obtain those that were posted on the same day, as the Twitter API provides tweets posted over the last 7 days. **(3) URL extraction:** After manually inspecting a random sample of 100 tweets, we found that many “phishing” tweets are *educational*, and are about phishing threats in general, or provide some stories about phishing events. We also found that the tweets with phishing reports usually include the obfuscated URL of the potential phishing website, e.g., using “hxxps[:]//xyz[.]com,” or “hXXp:[/]xyz[dot]com.” Therefore, the third module employed regular expressions to retrieve the tweets with obfuscated URLs and obtain those tweets claiming about specific websites being phishing websites. We manually checked the obtained tweets and found that the precision of this module is 1, and our final dataset only includes tweets with phishing claims. Finally, we extracted the URLs from these tweets to be validated.

**Final Dataset:** Our aggregated dataset includes about 165K tweets with the keyword “phishing,” from which 17,770 tweets are phishing claims. Since we obtained only phishing claims with obfuscated URLs, our analysis provides an estimate of the prevalence of misinformation regarding phishing websites on Twitter.

After data collection, on May 3, 2021, the following modules were employed: **(4) Checking unique URLs via VirusTotal:** This module evaluated the URLs daily by passing them through VirusTotal API [10]. VirusTotal provides aggregated results for an URL obtained from 80 scan engines by third-party security vendors. Given a particular URL, the API [11] returns the labels from all the vendors, and it shows the number of scan engines that detected the URL as *malicious* and *benign*. Previous work [56, 79] has pointed out that VirusTotal is slow in updating its database and hence there is a high probability that a website that was flagged as benign on the first day, be flagged malicious later on. To overcome this limitation, the module employed VirusTotal three weeks after the last day of data collection. Using the results from VirusTotal, the module labeled each URL either as *benign* or *malicious*. **(5) Checking benign URLs on PhishTank:** Since anti-phishing engines can misclassify malicious URLs as benign, this module further passed all the URLs labeled as *benign* to PhishTank. PhishTank [5] is a free community-based site, where anyone can submit phishing reports. These reports are then validated by some human verifiers, and added to/ removed from the database.

We assume that if a website is active, benign, and not reported to Phishtank, then with a high probability they are misinformation. **(6) Manual inspection of benign URLs:** Since it is also possible that the malicious URLs have not been reported to the PhishTank, additionally, we manually checked the *benign* URLs. Particularly, on a virtual machine, we checked whether the URL is mimicking a

login page or prompting users to download something (commonly known as Drive-by-Download).

**Final Results:** Table 1 shows our final dataset. We found a union set of 11,472 users who posted 17,770 phishing reports on Twitter. In total, among 10,578 unique URLs, we identified 9,603 as *malicious* and 975 (about 9%) as *benign*, which are corresponding to 13,875 and 3,895 tweets, respectively. Therefore, we can conclude that about 9% of all obfuscated URLs, and about 22% of tweets, are *misinformation*. We also found that 11,472 unique users with true and 148 unique users with false claims, with 124 users posting a mix of true and false claims.

Our results show that the spread of misinformation about phishing websites in social media is very comparable with that of misinformation in other domains, specifically health misinformation. For example, previous scholarships [29, 39, 71] have found a similar prevalence of misinformation about *vaccines* (24%, 25%, and 25%, respectively).

### 3.1 Accounts and Campaign Characterization

We study the visibility of false phishing claims in terms of the number of followers and retweets. We also identify and characterize campaigns against benign websites that are claimed to be phishing.

**3.1.1 Descriptive Statistics.** Table 2 statistically describes the user accounts with true and false claims, i.e., those whose claims about phishing websites were labeled as true or false, accordingly. If a user had posted both true and false claims, we considered them in both sets. We compared the account characteristics of users with true claims vs. false claims. To compare features, such as *Followers*, *Friends*, & *Tweets*, we ran Mann-Whitney U tests because they do not follow a normal distribution. We could not reject the null hypothesis that users with *false* and *true* claims have the same distribution of followers counts, friends count, and tweet counts. We ran chi-square test for the *verified* variable, and could not reject the null hypothesis. We also compared the account characteristics of these users with random Twitter users and found users posting about phishing have different characteristics than random users. The results are presented in Appendix A.1.


**3.1.2 Spread of Misinformation: Followers Count.** The first viewers of misinformation are followers of the accounts posting false claims. From Table 2, you can see that a user with false claims has had about 35K followers on the date of collection, and the mean number of followers is about 2K. On May 3rd, we obtained the list of followers. We could not obtain the union set of all followers, because about 34 accounts have made their profiles protected since our data collection. In total, these accounts have 172K followers. Interestingly, we found that most accounts posting misinformation are following each other, and only 40 of such accounts were not following other accounts in our false claim dataset. For example,

**Table 1: We found 22% of phishing reports to be misinformation, as they were inaccurately reported as phishing websites.**

No. of Tweets	Unique Users	Unique URLs	Malicious URLs	Benign URLs	Malicious Tweets	Benign Tweets (Misinformation)	Accounts with true claims	Accounts with false claims
17,770	11,472	10,578	9,603	975 (9%)	13,875	3,895 (22%)	11,200	148

**Table 2: Descriptive statistics of our final datasets.**

Feature	Users with true claims				Users with false claims			
	Mean	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Min	Max	Median
Followers	6,210	0	~ 12M	302	2,049	0	~ 35K	426
Friends	1,347	0	~ 275K	416	1,264	0	~ 22K	458
Tweets	29,972	1	~ 3.4M	4,883	60,293	6	~ 2.2M	5,426
Verified	0.02	0	1	NA	0.01	0	1	NA




**Figure 3: Communities detected in false claim dataset**

one such account was following 37 other accounts with false claims which was the highest count. Our analysis showed that a lot of accounts (about 3%) echoed the false claim (misinformation) and hence further increasing the dissemination of misinformation.


**3.1.3 Spread of Misinformation: Campaigns.** We constructed a network based on *following* relationships between all users in our false claim dataset using the Louvain Community Detection method [30]. We considered a directed graph as  $(x,y) \in E$  does not necessarily mean that  $(y,x) \in E$ . Figure 3 shows the communities that were detected. In total, our network has 121 nodes and 618 edges. This is only a subset of the users, as we were not able to obtain the followers of 34 accounts. The average weighted degree is 5.1. The longest shortest path or network diameter between nodes is 9, and the average path length from one randomly selected node to another is 2.47. In total, we were able to obtain 6 communities which are shown in different colors such as, pink (37 nodes), green (34 nodes), purple (22 nodes), red (22 nodes), blue (4 nodes), and light green (2 nodes).

The biggest community shown in pink has 30.58% of all the nodes, while the smallest community shown in light green has only 2 nodes. Interestingly, we found that 66 accounts posted the same false claims in their community. Also, the community shown in pink contributes to about 51% of the false claims.

**3.1.4 Spread of Misinformation: Retweets Count.** To capture the spread of false phishing claims beyond an account’s followers, we studied retweet counts for each false claim. Retweets can indicate agreement, endorsement, and even trust [72], therefore retweeting



**Figure 4: Histogram of retweets and tweets for false claims.**



**Figure 5: Histogram of users based on false claim rate**

the false claims can even cause higher damage, as people might trust the content more. Figure 4a shows the histogram of the number of retweets for URLs with false claims. Interestingly, we found that 764 (67%) of all URLs with false claims were retweeted more than once. This can show that: first, some Twitter users have already had some level of trust in the accounts posting the false phishing claims, and second, the followers of users, who retweeted the claims, might trust the content even more as two accounts have posted it.

**3.1.5 Campaign Detection: Campaigns against Specific Websites.** Figure 4b shows the histogram of tweet counts for all the websites in our false claimed dataset. While most of the websites have been falsely reported in only one tweet, there are some campaigns where a phishing claim against a specific website has been tweeted multiple times. We identified 32 URLs, that were tweeted more than 3 times, by a total of 24 unique users. This suggests the existence of campaigns against specific websites.

**3.1.6 Campaign Detection: Users with Many False Claims.** Figure 5 shows the histogram of users with false claims divided by their total number of phishing claims. We found that only a small number of users have posted many phishing claims. Interestingly, we found one user with 650 false claims and 3K true claims. About 78% of the users in our dataset, i.e., 8,942 users, have only true claims, while 29 users have only *false claims*. Also, 502 (4.37%) users have a false claim rate of around 0.5. Almost all of these users have an equal amount of tweets, i.e., one true claim and one false claim (310 users) or two true claims and two false claims (174 users). Users that have only posted *false claims* are suspicious and they might have maliciously and deliberately sent these tweets.

## 4 ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL MEDIA DISCUSSIONS ABOUT ZOOM'S SECURITY AND PRIVACY

In this section, we focus on social media discussions around Zoom's security and privacy during the COVID-19 pandemic and study the presence and prevalence of misinformation regarding it on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and Reddit. Analyzing public data from multiple social media platforms can help us to investigate how misinformation is circulated differently on these platforms.

To detect misinformation posts in each social media platform, we developed a binary classifier specific to that platform. Figure 6 shows the steps that were employed for building such classifiers: (1) Data collection, (2) Groundtruth and taxonomy creation, (3) Feature selection, (4) Training and testing classifiers, and (5) Detecting the misinformation in each platform.

### 4.1 Data Collection

In order to collect data from Facebook, Instagram, Reddit, and Twitter, we used the "posts/search" endpoint of the CrowTangle API [102]. The CrowTangle API provides about 2% of all public Facebook groups and pages, 2M+ public Instagram pages, and about 20K+ of most active sub-reddits [22].

using the Observatory on Social Media API [38], which allows us to search tweets from the Decahose, a 10% random sample of public tweets.

We restricted our data to English and from June 1, 2019, to Nov. 30, 2020, because we wanted to see if users were discussing security and privacy issues of Zoom before the pandemic, and how the discussions changed when the pandemic started. We initially obtained posts that include the keyword *Zoom*.

**Table 3: The number of posts in each platform**

Platform	2019	2020	After filtering
Instagram	42,639	422,874	6,885
Facebook	167,718	4,537,280	74,590
Reddit	21,250	134,866	9,167
Twitter	4,051	114,420	8,127

*Pre-processing and filtering:* Table 3 shows the data collected from the four platforms. Since we collected the posts that included the keyword "Zoom," our dataset contained many posts not talking about security and privacy. To find additional keywords, we used the snowball sampling technique [43]. We started by using a couple of seed keywords, including Zoom, Security, and Privacy. We then extracted posts from our dataset for the month of March for each respective platform. Using the seed keywords, we iteratively identified potential keywords that frequently co-occur with the seeds, adding them to our seed list only after manually ensuring they are closely related to our topic. After saturation was reached, we manually combined keywords into composites. In total, we identified 18 such keywords, namely, *Zoom Malware*, *Zoom Phishing*, *Zoom Virus*, *Zoom Security*, *Zoom Exploit*, *Zoom Hijacking*, *Zoom Bug*, *Zoom Hackers*, *Zoom Privacy*, *Zoom Backdoor*, *Zoom Hacked*, *Zoom Security Bug*, *Zoom Windows*, *Zoom Passwords*, *Zoom Windows Steal*, *Zoombombing*, and *Zoom Data*. We then used our new expanded keyword list, to filter out the posts. The last column of Table 3 shows the final dataset that was obtained after our filtering.

### 4.2 Groundtruth Dataset

*4.2.1 Groundtruth Creation.* For training the classifiers, we first manually labeled a subset of the posts on each platform to create a groundtruth dataset. Creating a groundtruth is not a trivial task because we need to verify the correctness of claims and discussions. We used the following three criteria to label the posts: (a) The post is talking about "Zoom," (b) The post is talking about Zoom's security or privacy, and (c) The post is either providing some evidence, i.e., links, videos, etc., from reputable blogs or articles that are verifiable, or not providing supporting evidence, but we could verify the claims by cross-checking them with the reputable sources. For that, we checked the post context and ran a Google search to determine if the post context is already addressed by the company or reputable sources and if the claim can be validated. Using these criteria, we defined three labels: (1) *Zoom's security and privacy*: if a post satisfies all of the above mentioned criteria, (2) *Misinformation*: if the third criteria is not satisfied, and (3) *Irrelevant*: if it fails to satisfy either first or second criteria.

Some examples of the posts that were labeled are shown in Table 11 in Appendix A.2.

*4.2.2 Annotation Process.* To hand-label the posts, two authors annotated 13,200 posts (3,300 randomly chosen posts from each of Twitter, Instagram, Facebook & Reddit). For inconsistent results, coders discussed how to resolve disagreements. To assess the inter-coder reliability, we performed a Cohen-Kappa test [90]. The inter-rater agreement measured with Kappa score was 0.972, which shows almost perfect agreement. Table 4 shows the groundtruth dataset that was obtained after the annotation. We can observe that there are a significant number of *irrelevant* posts in our dataset, however, we do find evidence of misinformation in our dataset. We found 23 instances of users inviting other users to "Zoombomb" their classes or meetings. We found that 20 of these targets were for the platform *Zoom*, while the remaining three were for *Google Meet* [16].

**Table 4: The size of groundtruth datasets per platform.**

Platform	Zoom security & privacy	Misinformation	Irrelevant
Instagram	545	15	2,740
Facebook	560	42	2,734
Reddit	1,045	16	2,234
Twitter	1,865	36	1,468

### 4.3 Taxonomy Creation

Taxonomies help in understanding and representing data into categories and subcategories. Prior work has successfully implemented taxonomies to better understand the targets and the types of fake news and hate speech in the online discourse [57, 73, 109]. This motivates our research to build a taxonomy for misinformation about Zoom's security and privacy threats, so that we can understand their types and targets, and also can use the information about their categories and properties as features for classifying the posts.

We created a taxonomy of misinformation about Zoom's security and privacy threats, applying the open coding process [41]. Following this process, one of the authors coded the misinformation posts identified in the previous subsection until no new categories




Figure 6: The framework developed for detecting Zoom security & privacy misinformation.

emerged. To improve the quality of the categories, we used an iterative process [36], so that new categories were added, or existing ones were reorganized. To create the taxonomy, we followed certain guidelines: (1) Read through the posts, and identify themes and sub-themes; (2) While creating the categories, identify the motive and meaning of the post; and (3) Consider various features that can help in the identification of categories.

Table 5: Description of Categories in Taxonomy

Category	Description
Accusation	Accusing various countries and/or businesses of wrongdoing without relevant evidence.
Misleading	Misleading the audience, promoting and solidifying a myth that rejects accepted narrative, is aligned towards one way of thinking and draws conclusions based on a limited number of facts.
Sources	Providing altered videos or photos that are not in the context to create confusion; posting URLs that are invalid or are redirected to a third party site.
Structural	Post has all CAPS headline and content, and misspelling in the content.
Network	Has a large audience, is verified by the platform. Two or more sources show the same news with the same context over time.
Security	Post is about fake Zoombombing attacks, sponsors notion that using Zoom leads to hacking, data theft, leads to the backdoor for NSA, is malware and suggests no encryption used for chats and using Zoom leads to phishing attacks.
Privacy	Post suggests that users are being watched by government, promotes that user data is being mined by other companies, and sponsors the notion that since no encryption, anyone can read your chats.

Figure 7 shows the hierarchical structure of the taxonomy. The taxonomy has 4 main classes (sources, structural, network & post type), 4 sub-classes for *post type* class, i.e., accusation, misleading, security & privacy, and 22 subcategories in total. Table 5 gives a high level overview of the description of each of the classes. We discovered 4 main topics: (i) *Sources*: Posts which provide misleading sources videos, URLs or invalid links to other sites, (ii) *Structural*: Posts containing irregularities in the content like misspellings or

written in capitalization, (iii) *Network*: Relates to the reach or perceived audience of the author, and (iv) *Post Type*: subdivided into 3 categories talking about security related or privacy terms and text containing logic flaws, biased authors, or propagating conspiracy.

After saturation, two authors coded the 206 posts that were labeled as misinformation. To find the agreement score, we gave a value of 1, if two or more coders had a perfect agreement, otherwise, we divided the number of labels where two or more coders agreed by the number of possible values. Using this methodology, we found a substantial agreement of 72.3%.

The distribution of these posts among different classes are: Sources (78), Structural (56), Network (12), Accusation (69), Misleading (65), Security (194), and Privacy (98). Note that one post could be assigned to multiple classes.

Interestingly, during our manual labeling, we found that two accounts, i.e., *NTD News & Epoch Times*, were constantly sharing the same news, with the same content. New York Times in an investigation found that *The publication and its affiliates employed a novel strategy that involved creating dozens of Facebook pages, filling them with feel-good videos and viral clickbait, and using them to sell subscriptions and drive traffic back to its partisan news coverage* [18].

#### 4.4 Detecting Posts about Zoom’s Security and Privacy Threats

Initially, we tried to use a multi label classifier to classify posts as either irrelevant, security and privacy related, or misinformation. We noticed mediocre results with this classifier, possibly due to the unbalanced nature of our dataset when comparing the number of misinformation posts with irrelevant posts. We then tried to use a binary classifier to differentiate misinformation posts from other irrelevant or security and privacy related posts. Similar to the first classifier model, this also yielded mediocre results due to an unbalanced dataset. We then built a binary classifier to detect Zoom’s security and privacy posts. We used the groundtruth dataset created in Section 4.2, where we combined the misinformation posts with Zoom’s security and privacy set and labeled them as “0,” and labeled irrelevant posts as “1.” We built one classifier for each of the four platforms as each platform gives a different style of data, e.g., Twitter allows up to 280 characters while there is no constraint on that of Facebook posts. To build our supervised classifiers, we used n-gram features. We found that a mix of uni-gram & bi-gram features provide a better result compared to uni-gram, bi-gram or tri-gram. Before extracting the features, we performed pre-processing




Figure 7: Zoom Misinformation Taxonomy

Table 6: Performance of classifiers detecting posts about Zoom security and privacy.

Platform	Accuracy	F1-Score	Precision	Recall
Instagram	0.94 (+/- 0.02)	0.93 (+/- 0.02)	0.93 (+/- 0.04)	0.94 (+/- 0.01)
Facebook	0.91 (+/- 0.02)	0.91 (+/- 0.02)	0.91 (+/- 0.02)	0.91 (+/- 0.04)
Reddit	0.93 (+/- 0.01)	0.93 (+/- 0.02)	0.93 (+/- 0.02)	0.93 (+/- 0.03)
Twitter	0.81 (+/- 0.02)	0.81 (+/- 0.01)	0.81 (+/- 0.03)	0.81 (+/- 0.01)

Table 7: Percentage of Zoom’s security and privacy posts.

Platform	Zoom’s security & privacy	Irrelevant
Instagram	551 (15%)	3,034
Facebook	11,400 (16%)	59,890
Reddit	627 (11%)	5,240
Twitter	2,927 (61%)	1,900

on our dataset, removed stop words, emojis, hashtags, and URLs. We vectorized our data using the TF-IDF [55].

Since our groundtruth dataset for each platform was unbalanced (see Table 4), we employed several oversampling techniques, such as RandomOversampler, Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique (SMOTE) [33], and Adaptive Synthetic Sampling (ADASYN) [49] using the imbalanced-learn library [65] and we tested multiple classification algorithms such as Random Forests, SVM, Naive-Bayes & Multi-Layer neural network using the scikit-learn library [78]. To evaluate our classifiers, we used k-cross validation, where  $k = 3$ . From our analysis we found that RandomOversampler was the best for Instagram, however, SMOTE provides better results for Facebook and Reddit. We did not oversample Twitter data because the groundtruth for this platform was already balanced. Table 6 shows the classification performance of Random Forrester classifier as it provided the best accuracy across all four platforms.

After developing classifiers that can detect posts related to Zoom’s security and privacy, we ran the classifier on the whole dataset obtained from all the platforms. Table 7 shows the number and percentage of posts that discuss Zoom’s security and privacy. As you can see, the percentage of security and privacy-related posts in our Instagram, Facebook, Reddit, and Twitter datasets are 15%, 16%, 11%, and 61%.

#### 4.5 Detecting Misinformation about Zoom’s Security and Privacy Threats

To estimate the prevalence of misinformation about Zoom’s security and privacy issues, we developed another classifier, which receives posts related to Zoom’s security and privacy and detect if they are misinformation. We trained a new binary classifier for each platform, using our already labeled groundtruth dataset.

4.5.1 *Textual and Contextual Feature Selection.* **Textual Features:** For each platform, we extracted bi-grams and uni-grams from all the posts and considered the top 100 of them with the highest values of TF-IDF, which resulted in 37 uni-grams and 63 bi-grams. We tested

our classifiers with 100, 500, 1000, 1500, and 2000 top n-grams, and across all platforms but Instagram, 100 provided the best results, while 500 provided the best results for Instagram. **Contextual Features:** Along with the textual features obtained from the posts, we extracted a set of contextual features from the meta-data, which include: (1) *Taxonomy-inspired features:* Creating the taxonomy, we found some features that are more apparent in misinformation posts. For example, in terms of post linguistics, they tend to have all CAPS content, in terms of network structure, they tend to have a large audience, and are verified, or in terms of sources, tend to provide altered videos or photos. Inspired by these properties, we used the following contextual features: *word counts, noun counts, pronouns counts, number of all CAPS words, misspelled words count, verified account, followers count, has a photo/video and has a URL.* (2) *Reaction-inspired features:* Posts can get some reaction, e.g., *likes, retweets/shares, comments,* etc. We used appropriate statistical tests, such as Mann-Whitney U test, T-Test, & Chi-Square test, to examine if such features are statistically different across the classes.

Based on the test results, we used the following features: for Instagram, *likes count,* for Facebook, the number of *likes, comments,* and *shares,* for Reddit, the number of *likes,* and *comments,* for Twitter, we did not find the number of *likes* and *retweets* significant, therefore we did not use them. (3) *Features based on account characteristics:* Having access to Twitter account meta-data, we examined if any of the account characteristics can distinguish misinformation posters. We used the following features: *tweets count, profile description length, account age, listed count,* and *has a profile image.*

4.5.2 *Classifiers.* Since our dataset is highly unbalanced, we used several oversampling techniques mentioned in the previous section, and we found RandomOverSampler provides the best results for Instagram and Reddit classifiers, and SMOTE provides the best results for Facebook and Twitter classifiers. Also, we found that out of the five machine learning algorithms, Random Forest provides the best accuracy across the four platforms. We compared the results of the different algorithms after performing hyperparameter tuning using

the GridSearchCV feature from sklearn in Python. Hyperparameter tuning conducts an exhaustive search over the parameters to find the best combination of parameters. Table 8 shows all classifiers, using k-cross validation ( $k = 3$ ), have great performance.

We further verified if our classifiers show consistent performance by randomly choosing 100 posts from each platform, manually labeling them, and computing the accuracy on these testing tests. We found that about 98% accuracy in the case of Instagram, 97% in the case of Reddit, 97% for Facebook, and 98% for Twitter, which is similar to those obtained during cross-validation.

We examined feature importance in the trained Random Forest model to understand which of the features have a higher importance in the classification tasks. The top 10 features and their scores for each model are: **Facebook:** no. of all CAPS words (0.083), word count (0.081), *company* (0.052), *behind* (0.046), *hey* (0.045), *live* (0.037), *police* (0.036), *state* (0.036), *data* (0.035), and *set* (0.035). **Reddit:** *company* (0.116), *China* (0.087), no. of likes (0.066), word count (0.060), *security* (0.050), *make* (0.047), *privacy* (0.043), *use* (0.042), *Zoom* (0.040), and No. of all CAPS words (0.039). **Instagram:** *Zoom* (0.084), No. of all CAPS words (0.034), word count (0.033), *security* (0.029), *away* (0.029), *would* (0.029), *virus* (0.028), *say* (0.028), no. of likes (0.026), and *news* (0.023). **Twitter:** Has photo/video (0.072), URL in Tweet (0.070), account age (0.049), *say* (0.043), has a profile image (0.042), *privacy* (0.041), *window* (0.038), tweets count (0.036), *Zoom* (0.031), and followers count (0.030). As you can see, the top features for each platform span a variety of feature categories, including textual features such as n-grams, and contextual features, consisting of taxonomy-, reaction-, and account- inspired features.


**Table 8: The performance of misinformation detection classifiers**

Platform	Accuracy	F1 Score	Precision	Recall
Instagram	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
	(+/- 0.01)	(+/- 0.02)	(+/- 0.01)	(+/- 0.02)
Facebook	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99
	(+/- 0.00)	(+/- 0.01)	(+/- 0.00)	(+/- 0.01)
Reddit	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99
	(+/- 0.01)	(+/- 0.01)	(+/- 0.00)	(+/- 0.01)
Twitter	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
	(+/- 0.01)	(+/- 0.02)	(+/- 0.02)	(+/- 0.01)

**Table 9: The percentage of misinformation in each platform.**

Platform	Misinformation	Unique users
Instagram	16 (3%)	9
Facebook	2,115 (10%)	1,517
Reddit	25 (4%)	22
Twitter	10 (0.4%)	8

**4.5.3 Results.** Finally, we employed our trained classifiers on the posts that are related to security and privacy to detect those that are misinformation. Table 9 shows the percentage of misinformation posts per platform. About 3% of posts on Instagram, 10% of them on Facebook and 4% and 0.4% of them on Reddit and Twitter are *misinformation*. When comparing our results with groundtruth dataset, we find that we are at par for Instagram and Facebook



**Figure 8: Misinformation growth rate.**

with the ratio of misinformation posts: total security and privacy posts (3% vs 3% & 10% vs 10%). For Reddit, we found a little more misinformation than our groundtruth (4% vs. 2%), while for Twitter we obtained fewer misinformation posts than our groundtruth dataset (0.4% vs 2%). These amounts of misinformation per platform highlight that individual platforms should dedicate resources to curb the spread of *misinformation* about cybersecurity & privacy.

**4.5.4 Growth of Misinformation.** To understand the growth of misinformation about Zoom security and privacy issues, Figure 8 shows the percentages of posts that our classifiers detected as misinformation over time. The black line represents the time when multiple states in the US went into COVID-19 lockdown [3]. As you can see, Twitter, Instagram, & Reddit follow similar patterns. However, in the case of Facebook, there are posts that were in 2019, informing users about Zoom’s security and privacy threats. We then manually inspected the posts, to understand what issues were being talked about Zoom. Our analysis revealed that, in the month of July 2019, users were discussing *Zoom hit by DoS*, however, we found that Zoom had a new zero-day vulnerability and not a DoS attack [2]. We see a sudden spike, in the number of misinformation posts first on Facebook around February 2020, and then subsequent spikes in Instagram, Twitter, and Reddit after March 2020. Our analysis revealed that users were claiming that Zoom is malware, a tool by the Chinese Communist party to spy on people, etc., however, these claims have been refuted [12, 13]. The plot shows a higher percentage of misinformation posted on Facebook when compared to other platforms. This might be because misinformation news is easier to be spread on Facebook due to a number of factors such as the users of Facebook, their moderation policies and also posting techniques.

## 5 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

The analysis on phishing misinformation gives a lower bound of the *misinformation* on Twitter because we had access to a 1% sample of Twitter data. Similarly, in our second study, the size of our datasets was restricted by *CrowdTangle*. Also, not having access to the followers and friends of users, we could not detect and analyze possible campaigns. In the future, we would extend our study to understand the impact of these misinformation websites on businesses and anti-phishing tools. We would also investigate the diffusion of

cybersecurity and privacy misinformation on various social networks and examine if they are different from that of political or public health misinformation.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we first examined the correctness of Twitter reports about websites being phishing. In total, we found that about 9% of all obfuscated URLs and about 22% of tweets about phishing websites are *misinformation*. Second, we examined the correctness of posts, about Zoom's security and privacy threats, that were shared on Twitter, Instagram, Reddit, and Facebook.

Using a set of textual and contextual features, we built supervised classifiers to identify posts discussing the security and privacy of Zoom, and to detect misinformation in our whole dataset. Our classifiers showed great performance across all four platforms.

We found about 3%, 10%, 4% and 0.4% of posts on Instagram, Facebook, Reddit, and Twitter, as misinformation, respectively. Our results show that misinformation about cybersecurity and privacy not only is present on social media platforms but also are prevalent. Therefore, the community needs to further study the misinformation on cybersecurity and investigate its impact on end-users and threat intelligence tools.

## REFERENCES

- [1] 2018. Kaspersky Blacklist. <https://support.kaspersky.com/KSMG/1.0/en-EN/91157.htm>.
- [2] 2019. Zoom Zero-Day Bug Opens Mac Users to Webcam Hijacking. <https://threatpost.com/zoom-zero-day-mac-webcam-hijacking/146317/>.
- [3] 2020. COVID-19 lockdowns. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/COVID-19\\_lockdowns](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/COVID-19_lockdowns).
- [4] 2020. Internet Crime Report- FBI. [https://www.ic3.gov/Media/PDF/AnnualReport/2020\\_IC3Report.pdf](https://www.ic3.gov/Media/PDF/AnnualReport/2020_IC3Report.pdf).
- [5] 2020. PhishTank. <https://www.phishtank.com/faq.php>.
- [6] 2020. Software Flaws Sometimes First Reported on Social Media. <https://www.pnnl.gov/news-media/software-flaws-sometimes-first-reported-social-media>.
- [7] 2020. The Virus Changed the Way We Internet. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/04/07/technology/coronavirus-internet-use.html>.
- [8] 2020. Thousands of Zoom video calls left exposed on open Web. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2020/04/03/thousands-zoom-video-calls-left-exposed-open-web/>.
- [9] 2020. Twitter Developer. <https://developer.twitter.com/en>.
- [10] 2020. VirusTotal. <https://www.virustotal.com/gui/home/upload>.
- [11] 2020. VirusTotal API. <https://developers.virustotal.com/reference>.
- [12] 2020. Zoom Finally Has End-to-End Encryption. Here's How to Use It. <https://www.wired.com/story/how-to-enable-zoom-encryption/>.
- [13] 2020. Zoom's Use of Facebook's SDK in iOS Client. <https://blog.zoom.us/zoom-use-of-facebook-sdk-in-ios-client/>.
- [14] 2020. 'Zoombombing' Attacks Disrupt Classes. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/03/26/zoombombers-disrupt-online-classes-racist-pornographic-content>.
- [15] 2021. Anti-Phishing Working Group. <https://apwg.org/>.
- [16] 2021. Google Meet. <https://meet.google.com/>.
- [17] 2021. Google Safebrowsing. <https://safebrowsing.google.com/>.
- [18] 2021. How The Epoch Times Created a Giant Influence Machine. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/10/24/technology/epoch-times-influence-falun-gong.html>.
- [19] 2021. IntelMQ. <http://github.com/certtools/intelmq/>.
- [20] 2021. Phishing Remains the Most Common Form of Attack. <https://blog.knowbe4.com/phishing-remains-the-most-common-form-of-attack>.
- [21] 2021. SpiderFoot, Open Source Intelligence Automation. <http://spiderfoot.net/>.
- [22] 2021. What data is CrowdTangle tracking? <https://help.crowdtangle.com/en/articles/1140930-what-data-is-crowdtangle-tracking>.
- [23] Hassan YA Abutair and Abdelfettah Belghith. 2017. Using case-based reasoning for phishing detection. *Procedia Computer Science* 109 (2017), 281–288.
- [24] Ahmed Aleroud and Lina Zhou. 2017. Phishing environments, techniques, and countermeasures: A survey. *Computers & Security* 68 (2017), 160–196.
- [25] Fernando Alves, Aurélien Bettini, Pedro M Ferreira, and Alysson Bessani. 2021. Processing tweets for cybersecurity threat awareness. *Information Systems* 95 (2021), 101586.
- [26] Ram B Basnet, Andrew H Sung, and Quingzhong Liu. 2012. Feature selection for improved phishing detection. In *International Conference on Industrial, Engineering and Other Applications of Applied Intelligent Systems*. Springer, 252–261.
- [27] Simon Bell and Peter Komisarczuk. 2020. An Analysis of Phishing Blacklists: Google Safe Browsing, OpenPhish, and PhishTank. In *Proceedings of the Australasian Computer Science Week Multiconference*. 1–11.
- [28] Marzieh Bitaab, Haehyun Cho, Adam Oest, Penghui Zhang, Zhibo Sun, Rana Pourmohamad, Doowon Kim, Tiffany Bao, Ruoyu Wang, Yan Shoshitaishvili, et al. 2021. Scam Pandemic: How Attackers Exploit Public Fear through Phishing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.12843* (2021).
- [29] Elizabeth B Blankenship, Mary Elizabeth Goff, Jingjing Yin, Zion Tsz Ho Tse, King-Wa Fu, Hai Liang, Nitin Saroha, and Isaac Chun-Hai Fung. 2018. Sentiment, contents, and retweets: a study of two vaccine-related twitter datasets. *The Permanente Journal* 22 (2018).
- [30] Vincent D Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. 2008. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment* 2008, 10 (2008), P10008.
- [31] J Scott Brennen, Felix Simon, Philip N Howard, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. 2020. Types, sources, and claims of COVID-19 misinformation. *Reuters Institute* 7 (2020), 3–1.
- [32] Marcus Butavicius, Kathryn Parsons, Malcolm Pattinson, and Agata McCormac. 2016. Breaching the human firewall: Social engineering in phishing and spear-phishing emails. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.00887* (2016).
- [33] Nitesh V Chawla, Kevin W Bowyer, Lawrence O Hall, and W Philip Kegelmeyer. 2002. SMOTE: synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *Journal of artificial intelligence research* 16 (2002), 321–357.
- [34] Kang Leng Chiew, Kelvin Sheng Chek Yong, and Choon Lin Tan. 2018. A survey of phishing attacks: their types, vectors and technical approaches. *Expert Systems with Applications* 106 (2018), 1–20.
- [35] Sharvari Prakash Chorghhe and Narendra Shekhar. 2016. A survey on anti-phishing techniques in mobile phones. In *2016 International Conference on Inventive Computation Technologies (ICICT)*, Vol. 2. IEEE, 1–5.
- [36] Juliet M Corbin and Anselm Strauss. 1990. Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative sociology* 13, 1 (1990), 3–21.
- [37] Emma Cueva, Grace Ee, Akshat Iyer, Alexandra Pereira, Alexander Roseman, and Dayrene Martinez. 2020. Detecting Fake News on Twitter Using Machine Learning Models. (2020).
- [38] Clayton A Davis, Giovanni Luca Ciampaglia, Luca Maria Aiello, Keychul Chung, Michael D Conover, Emilio Ferrara, Alessandro Flammini, Geoffrey C Fox, Xiaoming Gao, Bruno Gonçalves, et al. 2016. OSoMe: the IUNI observatory on social media. *PeerJ Computer Science* 2 (2016), e87.
- [39] Adam G Dunn, Julie Leask, Xujuan Zhou, Kenneth D Mandl, and Enrico Coiera. 2015. Associations between exposure to and expression of negative opinions about human papillomavirus vaccines on social media: an observational study. *Journal of medical internet research* 17, 6 (2015), e144.
- [40] Mohamed K Elhadad, Kin Fun Li, and Faye Gebali. 2019. Fake news detection on social media: a systematic survey. In *2019 IEEE Pacific Rim Conference on Communications, Computers and Signal Processing (PACRIM)*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [41] Barney G Glaser and Anselm L Strauss. 2017. *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Routledge.
- [42] Sanjay Goel, Kevin Williams, and Ersin Dincelli. 2017. Got phished? Internet security and human vulnerability. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* 18, 1 (2017), 2.
- [43] Leo A Goodman. 1961. Snowball sampling. *The annals of mathematical statistics* (1961), 148–170.
- [44] Chuan Guo, Juan Cao, Xueyao Zhang, Kai Shu, and Miao Yu. 2019. Exploiting emotions for fake news detection on social media. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.01728* (2019).
- [45] Brij B Gupta, Nalin AG Arachchilage, and Kostas E Psannis. 2018. Defending against phishing attacks: taxonomy of methods, current issues and future directions. *Telecommunication Systems* 67, 2 (2018), 247–267.
- [46] Brij B Gupta, Aakanksha Tewari, Ankit Kumar Jain, and Dharma P Agrawal. 2017. Fighting against phishing attacks: state of the art and future challenges. *Neural Computing and Applications* 28, 12 (2017), 3629–3654.
- [47] Surbhi Gupta, Abhishek Singhal, and Akanksha Kapoor. 2016. A literature survey on social engineering attacks: Phishing attack. In *2016 international conference on computing, communication and automation (ICCCA)*. IEEE, 537–540.
- [48] Reza Hassanpour, Erdogan Dogdu, Roya Choupani, Onur Goker, and Nazli Nazli. 2018. Phishing e-mail detection by using deep learning algorithms. In *Proceedings of the ACMSE 2018 Conference*. 1–1.
- [49] Haibo He, Yang Bai, Eduardo A Garcia, and Shutao Li. 2008. ADASYN: Adaptive synthetic sampling approach for imbalanced learning. In *2008 IEEE international joint conference on neural networks (IEEE world congress on computational intelligence)*. IEEE, 1322–1328.
- [50] Rae Hodge. 2020. Zoom security issues: Zoom buys security company, aims for end-to-end encryption. <https://www.cnet.com/news/zoom-security-issues-zoom-buys-security-company-aims-for-end-to-end-encryption/>.

- [51] Robert Hornik, Ava Kikut, Emma Jesch, Chioma Woko, Leeann Siegel, and Kwanho Kim. 2021. Association of COVID-19 misinformation with face mask wearing and social distancing in a nationally representative US sample. *Health communication* 36, 1 (2021), 6–14.
- [52] Seyedmehdi Hosseinimotlagh and Evangelos E Papalexakis. 2018. Unsupervised content-based identification of fake news articles with tensor decomposition ensembles. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Misinformation and Misbehavior Mining on the Web (MIS2)*.
- [53] Binxuan Huang and Kathleen M Carley. 2020. Disinformation and misinformation on twitter during the novel coronavirus outbreak. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04278* (2020).
- [54] Fang Jin, Edward Dougherty, Parang Saraf, Yang Cao, and Naren Ramakrishnan. 2013. Epidemiological modeling of news and rumors on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 7th workshop on social network mining and analysis*. 1–9.
- [55] Karen Sparck Jones. 1972. A statistical interpretation of term specificity and its application in retrieval. *Journal of documentation* (1972).
- [56] Alex Kantchelian, Michael Carl Tschantz, Sadia Afroz, Brad Miller, Vaishaal Shankar, Rekha Bachwani, Anthony D Joseph, and J Doug Tygar. 2015. Better malware ground truth: Techniques for weighting anti-virus vendor labels. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*. 45–56.
- [57] Eleni Kapantai, Androniki Christopoulou, Christos Berberidis, and Vassilios Peristeras. 2020. A systematic literature review on disinformation: Toward a unified taxonomical framework. *new media & society* (2020), 1461444820959296.
- [58] Hamid Karimi, Proteek Roy, Sari Saba-Sadiya, and Jiliang Tang. 2018. Multi-source multi-class fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 27th international conference on computational linguistics*. 1546–1557.
- [59] Hamid Karimi and Jiliang Tang. 2019. Learning hierarchical discourse-level structure for fake news detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.07389* (2019).
- [60] Rupinder Paul Khandpur, Taoran Ji, Steve Jan, Gang Wang, Chang-Tien Lu, and Naren Ramakrishnan. 2017. Crowdsourcing cybersecurity: Cyber attack detection using social media. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 1049–1057.
- [61] Mahmoud Khonji, Youssef Iraqi, and Andrew Jones. 2013. Phishing detection: a literature survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 15, 4 (2013), 2091–2121.
- [62] Ramez Kouzy, Joseph Abi Jaoude, Afif Kraitem, Molly B El Alam, Basil Karam, Elio Adib, Jabra Zarka, Cindy Traboulsi, Elie W Akl, and Khalil Baddour. 2020. Coronavirus goes viral: quantifying the COVID-19 misinformation epidemic on Twitter. *Cureus* 12, 3 (2020).
- [63] Ba Dung Le, Guanhua Wang, Mehwish Nasim, and Ali Babar. 2019. Gathering cyber threat intelligence from Twitter using novelty classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.01755* (2019).
- [64] Quentin Le Sceller, ElMouatez Billah Karbab, Mourad Debbabi, and Farkhund Iqbal. 2017. Sonar: Automatic detection of cyber security events over the twitter stream. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security*. 1–11.
- [65] Guillaume Lemaître, Fernando Nogueira, and Christos K. Aridas. 2017. Imbalanced-learn: A Python Toolbox to Tackle the Curse of Imbalanced Datasets in Machine Learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18, 17 (2017), 1–5. <http://jmlr.org/papers/v18/16-365.html>
- [66] Tian Lin, Daniel E Capecchi, Donovan M Ellis, Harold A Rocha, Sandeep Dommaraju, Daniela S Oliveira, and Natalie C Ebner. 2019. Susceptibility to spear-phishing emails: Effects of internet user demographics and email content. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)* 26, 5 (2019), 1–28.
- [67] Sahil Loomba, Alexandre de Figueiredo, Simon J Piatek, Kristen de Graaf, and Heidi J Larson. 2021. Measuring the impact of COVID-19 vaccine misinformation on vaccination intent in the UK and USA. *Nature human behaviour* 5, 3 (2021), 337–348.
- [68] Jennifer S Love, Adam Blumenberg, and Zane Horowitz. 2020. The parallel pandemic: Medical misinformation and COVID-19: Primum non nocere. *Journal of general internal medicine* 35 (2020), 2435–2436.
- [69] David M Markowitz and Jeffrey T Hancock. 2014. Linguistic traces of a scientific fraud: The case of Diederik Stapel. *PLoS one* 9, 8 (2014), e105937.
- [70] Sourena Maroofi, Maciej Korczyński, and Andrzej Duda. 2020. Are You Human? Resilience of Phishing Detection to Evasion Techniques Based on Human Verification. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. 78–86.
- [71] Philip M Massey, Amy Leader, Elad Yom-Tov, Alexandra Budenz, Kara Fisher, and Ann C Klassen. 2016. Applying multiple data collection tools to quantify human papillomavirus vaccine communication on Twitter. *Journal of medical Internet research* 18, 12 (2016), e318.
- [72] Panagiotis Metaxas. 2017. Retweets indicate agreement, endorsement, trust: A meta-analysis of published Twitter research. *Arxiv. Retrieved from http://cs.wellesley.edu/~pmetaxas/WorkingPapers/Retweet-meaning.pdf* (2017).
- [73] Maria D Molina, S Shyam Sundar, Thai Le, and Dongwon Lee. 2019. "Fake news" is not simply false information: a concept explication and taxonomy of online content. *American behavioral scientist* (2019), 0002764219878224.
- [74] Federico Monti, Fabrizio Frasca, Davide Eynard, Damon Mannion, and Michael M Bronstein. 2019. Fake news detection on social media using geometric deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.06673* (2019).
- [75] Adam Oest, Yeganeh Safaei, Penghui Zhang, Brad Wardman, Kevin Tyers, Yan Shoshitaishvili, and Adam Doupe. 2020. Phishtime: Continuous longitudinal measurement of the effectiveness of anti-phishing blacklists. In *29th {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 20)*. 379–396.
- [76] Adam Oest, Yeganeh Safei, Adam Doupe, Gail-Joon Ahn, Brad Wardman, and Gary Warner. 2018. Inside a phisher's mind: Understanding the anti-phishing ecosystem through phishing kit analysis. In *2018 APWG Symposium on Electronic Crime Research (eCrime)*. IEEE, 1–12.
- [77] Ahmet Okutan, Shanchieh Jay Yang, and Katie McConky. 2017. Predicting cyber attacks with bayesian networks using unconventional signals. In *Proceedings of the 12th Annual Conference on Cyber and Information Security Research*. 1–4.
- [78] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12 (2011), 2825–2830.
- [79] Peng Peng, Limin Yang, Linhai Song, and Gang Wang. 2019. Opening the blackbox of virustotal: Analyzing online phishing scan engines. In *Proceedings of the Internet Measurement Conference*. 478–485.
- [80] Tianrui Peng, Ian Harris, and Yuki Sawa. 2018. Detecting phishing attacks using natural language processing and machine learning. In *2018 IEEE 12th international conference on semantic computing (icsc)*. IEEE, 300–301.
- [81] Pawan Prakash, Manish Kumar, Ramana Rao Kompella, and Minaxi Gupta. 2010. Phishtnet: predictive blacklisting to detect phishing attacks. In *2010 Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [82] Routhu Srinivasa Rao and Alwyn Roshan Pais. 2019. Detection of phishing websites using an efficient feature-based machine learning framework. *Neural Computing and Applications* 31, 8 (2019), 3851–3873.
- [83] Hannah Rashkin, Eunsol Choi, Jin Yea Jang, Svitlana Volkova, and Yejin Choi. 2017. Truth of varying shades: Analyzing language in fake news and political fact-checking. In *Proceedings of the 2017 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*. 2931–2937.
- [84] Alan Ritter, Evan Wright, William Casey, and Tom Mitchell. 2015. Weakly supervised extraction of computer security events from twitter. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web*. 896–905.
- [85] Sayak Saha Roy, Unique Karanjit, and Shirin Nilizadeh. 2021. What Remains Uncaught?: Characterizing SparselyDetected Malicious URLs on Twitter. [https://madweb.work/preprints/madweb21-paper28-pre\\_print\\_version.pdf](https://madweb.work/preprints/madweb21-paper28-pre_print_version.pdf). *Madweb preprint 2021* (2021).
- [86] Natali Ruchansky, Sungyong Seo, and Yan Liu. 2017. Csi: A hybrid deep model for fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 797–806.
- [87] Carl Sabottke, Octavian Suci, and Tudor Dumitras. 2015. Vulnerability Disclosure in the Age of Social Media: Exploiting Twitter for Predicting Real-World Exploits. In *24th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 15)*. USENIX Association, Washington, D.C., 1041–1056. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity15/technical-sessions/presentation/sabottke>
- [88] Ozgur Koray Sahingoz, Ebubekir Buber, Onder Demir, and Banu Diri. 2019. Machine learning based phishing detection from URLs. *Expert Systems with Applications* 117 (2019), 345–357.
- [89] Anna Sapienza, Alessandro Bessi, Saranya Damodaran, Paulo Shakarian, Kristina Lerman, and Emilio Ferrara. 2017. Early warnings of cyber threats in online discussions. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*. IEEE, 667–674.
- [90] Christof Schuster. 2004. A note on the interpretation of weighted kappa and its relations to other rater agreement statistics for metric scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 64, 2 (2004), 243–253.
- [91] Gautam Kishore Shahi, Anne Dirkson, and Tim A Majchrzak. 2021. An exploratory study of covid-19 misinformation on twitter. *Online Social Networks and Media* 22 (2021), 100104.
- [92] Chengcheng Shao, Giovanni Luca Ciampaglia, Onur Varol, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. 2017. The spread of fake news by social bots. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.07592* 96 (2017), 104.
- [93] Chengcheng Shao, Giovanni Luca Ciampaglia, Onur Varol, Kai-Cheng Yang, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. 2018. The spread of low-credibility content by social bots. *Nature communications* 9, 1 (2018), 1–9.
- [94] Himani Sharma, Er Meenakshi, and Sandeep Kaur Bhatia. 2017. A comparative analysis and awareness survey of phishing detection tools. In *2017 2nd IEEE International Conference on Recent Trends in Electronics, Information & Communication Technology (RTEICT)*. IEEE, 1437–1442.
- [95] Hossein Shirazi, Bruhadeshwar Bezawada, and Indrakshi Ray. 2018. "Kn0w Thy DomaIn Name" Unbiased Phishing Detection Using Domain Name Based Features. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM on Symposium on Access Control Models and Technologies*. 69–75.

- [96] Kai Shu, Amy Sliva, Suhang Wang, Jiliang Tang, and Huan Liu. 2017. Fake news detection on social media: A data mining perspective. *ACM SIGKDD explorations newsletter* 19, 1 (2017), 22–36.
- [97] Kai Shu, Suhang Wang, and Huan Liu. 2019. Beyond news contents: The role of social context for fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the twelfth ACM international conference on web search and data mining*, 312–320.
- [98] Lisa Singh, Shweta Bansal, Leticia Bode, Ceren Budak, Guangqing Chi, Kornraphop Kawintiranon, Colton Padden, Rebecca Vanarsdall, Emily Vraga, and Yanchen Wang. 2020. A first look at COVID-19 information and misinformation sharing on Twitter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.13907* (2020).
- [99] Gunikhan Sonowal and KS Kuppasamy. 2020. PhiDMA—A phishing detection model with multi-filter approach. *Journal of King Saud University—Computer and Information Sciences* 32, 1 (2020), 99–112.
- [100] Alex Sumner and Xiaohong Yuan. 2019. Mitigating Phishing Attacks: An Overview. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Southeast Conference*, 72–77.
- [101] Choon Lin Tan, Kang Leng Chiew, KokSheik Wong, et al. 2016. PhishWHO: Phishing webpage detection via identity keywords extraction and target domain name finder. *Decision Support Systems* 88 (2016), 18–27.
- [102] CrowdTangle Team. 2020. CrowdTangle. Facebook, Menlo Park, California, United States.
- [103] Aakanksha Tewari, AK Jain, and BB Gupta. 2016. Recent survey of various defense mechanisms against phishing attacks. *Journal of Information Privacy and Security* 12, 1 (2016), 3–13.
- [104] William Yang Wang. 2017. "liar, liar pants on fire": A new benchmark dataset for fake news detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00648* (2017).
- [105] Yaqing Wang, Fenglong Ma, Zhiwei Jin, Ye Yuan, Guangxu Xun, Kishlay Jha, Lu Su, and Jing Gao. 2018. Eann: Event adversarial neural networks for multimodal fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 24th acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, 849–857.
- [106] Colin Whittaker, Brian Ryner, and Marria Nazif. 2010. Large-scale automatic classification of phishing pages. (2010).
- [107] Ellery Wulczyn, Nithum Thain, and Lucas Dixon. 2017. Ex machina: Personal attacks seen at scale. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 1391–1399.
- [108] Ping Yi, Yuxiang Guan, Futai Zou, Yao Yao, Wei Wang, and Ting Zhu. 2018. Web phishing detection using a deep learning framework. *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing* 2018 (2018).
- [109] Savvas Zannettou, Michael Sirivianos, Jeremy Blackburn, and Nicolas Kourtellis. 2019. The web of false information: Rumors, fake news, hoaxes, clickbait, and various other shenanigans. *Journal of Data and Information Quality (JDIQ)* 11, 3 (2019), 1–37.
- [110] Yue Zhang, Jason I Hong, and Lorrie F Cranor. 2007. Cantina: a content-based approach to detecting phishing web sites. In *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on World Wide Web*, 639–648.
- [111] Xinyi Zhou, Jindi Wu, and Reza Zafarani. 2020. SAFE: Similarity-Aware Multi-Modal Fake News Detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04981* (2020).

## A APPENDIX

### A.1 Comparison of Account Characteristics of Users Posting Phishing Reports

Table 10 statistically describes the user accounts with true and false claims,

as well as those in our random dataset. If a user had posted both true and false claims, we considered them in both sets. To have a baseline for comparing accounts' characteristics, we collected a random set of 1.1M tweets, using the Twitter streaming API from October 5th 2021 to October 11th 2021.

To minimize the bias towards users with higher posting rates, we randomly sampled 20K users out of 789K unique users.

Followers and listed counts can indicate the visibility of accounts.

Twitter listed counts can indicate that the user is known for some topic or expertise. These two variables do not follow a normal distribution, and therefore, to compare users, we ran Mann-Whitney U tests. The results

show that accounts who post *true* claims about phishing websites, on average have lower number of followers ( $Med = 302$  vs.  $Med = 321$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) compared to those in the *random* dataset. However, we could not reject the null hypothesis that users with *false* and

*true* claims have the same distribution of followers counts, and that users with *false* claims and *random* users have the same distribution of followers counts.

The results also show that accounts who post *false* and *true* claims about phishing websites, on average have been listed more ( $Med_{false} = 10$  vs.  $Med_{rand} = 1$ ,  $Med_{true} = 6$  vs.  $Med_{rand} = 1$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) compared to those in the *random* dataset. This indicates that users with *false* and *true* claims are known for more expertise compared to *random* users. Also, accounts who post *false* claims about phishing websites, on average have been listed more ( $Med_{false} = 10$  vs.  $Med_{true} = 6$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) compared to those who post *true* claims. Interestingly this suggests that accounts with *false* claims are more likely to be known for some expertise.

We also compared other account characteristics related to *identifiability* of accounts, including: *verified*, *profile image*, *account age*, *length of profile description*, and *URL*. Depending on the type of variable, we ran t-test or chi-square tests to compare the distributions. We found that on average users with *true* and *false* claims have older accounts than random users ( $M_{true} = 7$  vs  $M_{rand} = 4$ ) ( $t = 65.05$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and ( $M_{false} = 6$  vs  $M_{rand} = 4$ ) ( $t = 7.50$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), respectively, and users with *false* and *true* claims have a longer profile description than random users ( $M_{false} = 84$  vs  $M_{rand} = 69$ ) ( $t = 3.87$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and ( $M_{true} = 87$  vs  $M_{rand} = 69$ ) ( $t = 29.82$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), respectively.

Running chi-square tests for the binary variables, we found that users who post *false* and *true* claims are more likely to have a URL compared to *random* users, ( $M_{false} = 0.42$  vs.  $M_{rand} = 0.29$ ) ( $X^2 = 11.72$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and ( $M_{true} = 0.46$  vs.  $M_{rand} = 0.29$ ) ( $X^2 = 849.81$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), respectively. In addition, users who post *false* and *true* claims are more likely to have a profile image compared to *random* users ( $M_{false} = 0.48$  vs.  $M_{rand} = 0.76$ ) ( $X^2 = 64.80$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and ( $M_{true} = 0.47$  vs.  $M_{rand} = 0.76$ ) ( $X^2 = 2,576.58$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), respectively. Moreover, accounts who post *true* claims are more likely to be verified compared to *random* users ( $M_{true} = 0.02$  vs.  $M_{rand} = 0.008$ ) ( $X^2 = 216.84$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). However, we could not reject the null hypotheses that users with *false* and *true* claims have the same distributions of the *identifiability* characteristics. Interestingly, this result is not consistent with that of other works that show less identifiable accounts tend to send malicious content and misinformation [92, 93, 107]. This can be because these accounts are more likely to post technical content, and have already established themselves as experts in some domain.

### A.2 Zoom Post Examples

Table 11 gives some examples of the posts that were manually labeled. The first row talks about how Zoom is a privacy disaster and is corrupt, the tweet provides a link that goes to the *Guardian* website, hence we labeled it as *Zoom's security and privacy*. The second example is saying that "No end-to-end encryption for call," which is not true because Zoom addressed this issue back in February of 2020 (check this article [12]), and this post was tweeted on April 24th. Hence, we labeled this post as *misinformation*. The last row is discussing a Japanese fashion brand now sells T-shirts for #Zoom, which is *irrelevant*.

**Table 10: Descriptive statistics of our final datasets.**

Feature	Type	Users with true claims				Users with false claims				Random Users			
		Mean	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Min	Max	Median
Followers	Count	6,210	0	12,000,344	302	2,049	0	35,241	426	3,628	0	2,148,896	321
Friends	Count	1,347	0	274,824	416	1,264	0	21,700	458	1,210	0	963,934	420
Tweets	Count	29,972	1	3,427,366	4,883	60,293	6	2,233,656	5,426	32,244	1	5,982,184	8,921
Listed Count	Count	101	0	14,432	6	110	0	6,785	10	19	0	18,863	1
Profile Descr.	Count	87	0	229	98	84	0	175	81	69	1	200	57
Account Age	Count	7	0	15	8	6	0	14	6	4	0	14	3
URL in Profile	Bool.	0.46	0	1	NA	0.42	0	1	NA	0.29	0	1	NA
Profile Image	Bool.	0.47	0	1	NA	0.48	0	1	NA	0.76	0	1	NA
Verified	Bool.	0.02	0	1	NA	0.01	0	1	NA	0.008	0	1	NA

**Table 11: Examples of posts and assigned labels.**

No.	Post	Label	Reason
1	Security researchers have called Zoom “a privacy disaster” and “fundamentally corrupt” as allegations of the company mishandling user data snowball #Data #Breach #Zoom <a href="https://t.co/r3NcjsmuAB">https://t.co/r3NcjsmuAB</a>	Zoom’s security & privacy	Satisfies all the criteria and link goes to “Guardian” website
2	@XXX CEO @XXX: With the popularity of #Zoom, some security concerns have come to light-No end-to-end encryption for call- Sale of user data and analytics without disclosing or proper authorization. #UpskillGang #MilimaCyberAwareness @XXX’ [Tweeted on April 24th 2020]	Misinformation	Fails to provide evidence and that no end-to end encryption is false (check this article [12]) and that it sells user data (check this article [13])
3	[#coronavirus] Japanese fashion brand now sells T-shirts for #Zoom mtg. Change the color and design but basically only simple green T-shirts. Using the technology of virtual back ground and change as you like See below news. Seems to be nice! <a href="https://t.co/8ITMxtzKZb">https://t.co/8ITMxtzKZb</a>	Irrelevant	Not about cybersecurity